

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 309

RC 012 786

AUTHOR Furino, Antonio, Ed.
 TITLE The Role of the Social Scientist in Human Resource Development Policy and Programs for Hispanics. National Symposium on Hispanics and CETA (1980). Texas Univ., San Antonio. Coll. of Business.
 INSTITUTION Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
 SPONS AGENCY
 PUB DATE 80
 NOTE 288p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Data Collection; Employment Programs; *Hispanic Americans; Human Resources; Information Sources; *Labor Force; Labor Legislation; *Policy; Program Design; Program Implementation; *Research; Social Science Research; Work Environment
 IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

Conference speakers focused on three topics: Hispanics and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) policy and implementation issues; data sources; and research regarding Hispanic manpower. After introductory remarks by James W. Wagener, Eli Ginzberg and Tomas Rivera, Ernest Green discussed Hispanics and CETA. Harry Greenspan described CETA's legislative background, programs, and unresolved issues. William Mirengoff noted Hispanic CETA experience, citing opportunities for social science research. A panel discussed CETA policy-implementation realities. Howard Rosen described Employment and Training Administration research and development programs. Esteban E. Torres outlined Carter administration concerns for Hispanics. Sar A. Levitan and Leobardo Estrada discussed Hispanics and the 1980 Census. Rosemary Santana-Cooney described the Hispanic Research Center, Carlos Arce explained the National Chicano Survey, and Richard Santos discussed the National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experience. Harvey P. Hamel explained Bureau of Labor Statistics data; Jose Oscar Alers described the Puerto Rican Youth Employment Survey. Marta Tienda described Hispanic male employment patterns and earnings differentials. Gilbert Cardenas and Richard Santos assessed Hispanic CETA participation. Walter Fogel examined recent research on the Hispanic labor market experience. Summary reports of small sessions on workers and their characteristics, employers and the job environment, labor markets, and institutions and interventions were presented. (SR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
 * from the original document.

Rec July 1, 1981

National Symposium
on Hispanics
and CETA
1980

ED205309

RC 012786

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Human Resources Management and Development Program
College of Business
The University of Texas at San Antonio
In Cooperation with The United States Department of Labor

THE ROLE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST IN
HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND PROGRAMS FOR HISPANICS

A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON HISPANICS AND CETA

Sponsored by

THE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

In cooperation with

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The preparation of these proceedings was financed through a grant from the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. However, the authors are solely responsible for the accuracy of statements or interpretations contained herein.

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
Editor's Note and Acknowledgments	i
 I INTRODUCTION	
Welcome <i>James W. Wagener</i>	3
"Abrazo" <i>Tomas Rivera</i>	5
Hispanics in the Labor Force: A Few Modest Suggestions about Research and Policy <i>Eli Ginzberg</i>	11
 II POLICY ISSUES	
Hispanics and CETA <i>Ernest Green</i>	19
CETA Issues and Implementation <i>Harry Greenspan</i>	27
CETA Policy and Implementation Realities <i>William Mirengoff</i>	35
CETA Policy and Implementation Realities (Panel) <i>Pedro Garza,</i> <i>Roy Escarcega, Lupe Anguiano</i> Moderator <i>Henry Cisneros</i>	43
The Research and Development Program of the Employment and Training Administration <i>Howard Rosen</i>	57
Hispanics in the 1980s: A Work Force on the Move <i>Ambassador Esteban E. Torres</i>	67
 III DATA SOURCES	
What's in a Number? <i>Sar A. Levitan</i>	73
Hispanic Americans in the 1980 Census <i>Leobardo Estrada</i>	83
The Hispanic Research Center <i>Rosemary Santana-Cooney</i>	89
The National Chicano Survey <i>Carlos Arce</i>	93
The National Longitudinal Use Survey <i>Richard Santos</i>	105
Data and Reports of Persons of Hispanic Origins <i>Harvey Hamel</i>	113
The Puerto Rican Youth Employment Survey <i>Jose Oscar Alers</i>	119

IV RESEARCH

A Socioeconomic Profile of Hispanic-American Male Workers: Perspectives on Labor Utilization and Earnings <i>Marta Tienda</i>	125
Hispanic Participation in CETA: A Preliminary Assessment <i>Gilbert Cardenas</i> and <i>Richard Santos</i>	169
Research on Hispanics in the Labor Market <i>Walter Fogel</i>	225
Programs, Policy, and Research on Hispanic Americans (Small Group Sessions)	
Introduction <i>Fred Romero</i>	251
Workers and their Characteristics. Group Leader <i>Marta Tienda</i> . .	253
Employers and the Job Environment. Group Leader <i>Miguel Tirado</i> . .	259
Labor Markets. Group Leader <i>Ron Oaxaca</i>	261
Institutions and Interventions. Group Leader <i>Louise Wolitz</i> . . .	263
Summary <i>Fred Romero</i>	265

V CONCLUDING THE SYMPOSIUM

Closing Address <i>David Alvirez</i>	269
--	-----

Appendix A

The Program of the National Symposium on Hispanics and CETA	277
---	-----

EDITOR'S NOTE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As these proceedings go to press a new mayor has been elected in San Antonio, Texas. His name is Henry Cisneros, a young and very bright colleague with whom, seven years ago, I organized one of the first regional training conferences for the then newly created CETA prime sponsors. During the past three years, while a member of the City Council, he continued his teaching and directed the faculty development component of this UTSA Human Resources Management and Development Program (HRMDP). Now, he has won the mayoral race with a 2 to 1 margin over the next candidate. The event has obvious socioeconomic significance such as the evolution of an "old city" into a large urban center in a developing South, the shifting of power and of values, the assimilation and acceptance of new ethnic groups. Therefore, it has received broad news coverage and brought national notoriety to our city. Even a TV crew from West Germany came to gather facts for a story. As the world became aware that for the first time an Hispanic American is leading the municipal government of a major city in this nation, accompanying that awareness is the realization that it has not happened before. Some of the symbolic significance surrounding the newly elected Honorable Mayor Cisneros is inevitably lost in the cheers and boos of a heated political campaign and in the pragmatic reassessment of power and interests, but it is easily found, in all its socioeconomic, cultural, and institutional meaning, in these proceedings. They document the first large gathering of social scientists interested in the important but largely unexplored relationships linking persons of Hispanic origin to jobs.

As people in the market place are more than just factors of production but play the dual role of producers and consumers of goods and services, each social and administrative discipline offers a different segment of an elusive general theory of work and pay. The segmentation, familiar to the student of social sciences, makes development of new areas of knowledge slower and explanations obscure to scientists and practitioners alike. The nexus of interrelated factors that impinge on the experience and position of a minority group in the labor market is one of those intellectual frontiers. Ten years have passed since Grebler and his colleagues wrote The Mexican American People. The book and the research that inspired it were beset by conceptual and methodological problems, but its recognition that the literature on Hispanic Americans is mostly unidisciplinary and that a more integrative effort is necessary was valid and provocative. Effective communication across the disciplines and between scientists and research and program administrators was the major objective and perhaps the greatest accomplishment of the Symposium. It attracted scholars with varied backgrounds but a common interest in the Hispanic American worker. It provided a place to talk and to feel the intellectual kinship of explorers sharing the same uncharted

course. Participants were chosen and the program designed to make scientists communicate with practitioners and to let the operational bias of those who worked in the field sharpen the issues and spotlight the limitations in present knowledge. The ensuing discussion suggested directions for policy, reviewed recent studies and available data sources, and offered guidance on how to attain research support. In the process new friendships were made, old acquaintances renewed, and many good ideas born and later used in programs and research.

Two events coincident with the Symposium deserve special mention. Through a grant from the Department of Labor, the UTSA HRMD Program made travel expense awards to 11 young scholars insuring their participation in the symposium and fresh and enthusiastic contributions to the discussions. Their names and those of the universities they represented are listed at the end of this note.

The other event was the culmination of the career of a well known and respected research administrator. Dr. Howard Rosen, director of DOL/ETA Office of Research and Development since it was formed in 1962, announced his retirement from civil service. Most of us have, from time to time, agreed and disagreed with the research focus of Howard's office, but all of us have respected his undaunted professionalism, relied upon his experience, and used his intellectual strength. We are grateful to the DOL/ETA Office of Research and Development for the financial support that made the Symposium possible and to the professional talent generously offered by many persons in the Employment and Training Administration. To single out just a few of them, Dr. Fred Romero, Deputy Administrator for Policy, Evaluation, and Research, has provided inspiration, constructive criticism and most valuable support; Ellen Sehgal contributed to several early planning sessions; Fred Tello, the DOL project administrator, spent long hours beyond those required by the duties of his office to solve logistics problems and insure the cooperation of everyone; and Dr. Barnow, who accepted to fill Dr. Rosen's position and became thoroughly involved in the symposium. Dr. Walter Fogel of the University of California at Los Angeles, Dr. Richard Santos of the Center for Human Resources Research, Ohio State University, and Dr. Gilbert Cardenas of Pan American University participated in early organizational meetings and offered valuable suggestions on format and content. Our very warm thanks go to the Honorable Mayor Lila Cockrell who, as always, was responsive to our demands and graciously accepted an invitation to greet personally the Symposium participants. The support of the University of Texas at San Antonio was generous and broad based. President James Wagener, Academic Vice President Gordon Lamb, Dean Doug Hodo, Special Services Director Salvador Gomez, Dr. Jesse Zapata, Dr. Henry Cisneros, and many colleagues, administrators, and students generously gave their time and contributed to the event with intelligence and enthusiasm.

A very special recognition goes to the staff of the UTSA Human Resources Management and Development Program. Gene Rodriguez, co-director of the program, contributed his very special knowledge and

experience in human resource development to both the design and implementation of the Symposium. Lynda de la Vina, as assistant director, effectively supported the complex communication network among participants, sponsors, and organizers. Yolanda Penley, the program coordinator, whose organizational skills and even temper had been indispensable throughout the preparation period, missed the excitement of the actual event to give birth, on the first day of the symposium, to her son Jonathan. Sarah Smith extended her regular duties of budget control and research support to include the physical arrangements and logistics of the event. She was assisted by Lupe Ochoa, HRMDP research associate to whom must be credited the development of a comprehensive listing of scholars interested in Hispanic issues and the supervision of the typing and production of the proceedings. Finally, Delia Swiger, our student coordinator, expertly facilitated the participation of many of our students in that unique learning experience. Editorial assistance was provided by Dr. Gloriana St. Clair. The manuscripts were patiently typed by Ms. Linda Chapa.

Antonio Furino, Editor
Director, UTSA HRMD Program

RECIPIENTS OF YOUNG SCHOLAR AWARDS

Silverio Arenas, Jr.
Washington State University

Isaura M. Linares
Fordham University

Dr. Rene Baca
Arizona State University

Carlos F. Ortega
California State University
Northridge

Dr. George J. Borjas
University of California
at Santa Barbara

Dr. Arthur Padilla
University of North Carolina

Ellen Riojas Clark
The University of Texas
at San Antonio

Dr. Silvia Pedraza-Bailey
University of Chicago

Dr. John Garcia
University of Arizona

Dr. Ana Maria Rodriguez
San Diego State University

Dr. Armando R. Triana
De Paul University

INTRODUCTION

WELCOME

James W. Wagener*

The University of Texas at San Antonio is a young institution which has accepted students on campus only since 1975. As a public regional university, we have enjoyed a growth of about 9500 students in that length of time. We are proud of that growth and see it as a solid kind of commitment to higher education and a commitment from the community as well. I am also proud of the fact that growth has occurred not at the expense of the integrity of the institution or of its role as a center for thought, for learning, and for research.

This symposium may be seen as an outward and visible sign of one of the missions of this University: to apply learning to problems of public needs. The Human Resources Management and Development Program in the College of Business focuses the mission of the University on the need to prepare Hispanic Americans and other minority students for professional careers in the employment and training fields.

The symposium provides an occasion to exchange ideas, to explore possibilities, to foster a lasting collegueship for future efforts among the participants. The times we live in call for us to help each other to find provisional answers to some very broad and complex questions, to think through some of the simplistic generalizations that have us by the arm, if not by the throat.

For example, the generalization that all government is bad; that all universities are disinterested ivory towers, leaning ivory towers to be sure, but, nonetheless, disinterested ivory towers; that the unemployed, like the poor, will always be with us; that the academic world and the world of public policy issues must continue to keep each other at arm's length. It is to some of these general and half-true statements that the attention of the symposium is turned. It is, I think, a good start in dealing with some of these large issues.

*Dr. James W. Wagener is President of The University of Texas at San Antonio.

ABRAZO

Tomás Rivera*

It is an honor and a pleasure to be here. I spent some seven years working in San Antonio at UTSA, and have the fondest memories of the community and the university. The concept of an "Abrazo" is a cultural expression of many countries, and I am glad that within the Mexican American community we express it also. The "Abrazo" does reveal basically a behavioral attitude that means that there is respect among people, that there is acceptance, that there is recognition of the value of the person who is in front of you, that there is eagerness to communicate with that person, and that one wants this to be a continual concern and aspect of one's characteristics as a human being. I think that this behavior, of which an "Abrazo" is symbolic, is very important in all types of endeavors when one deals with institutions, and individuals and institutions.

Dr. Wagener was talking about the generalizations that exist nowadays, about government, about policy makers, about policies, about the incursion of the federal government or state government in our institutions. We, as public servants in those institutions, really need to take a look at the expectations we have from our own institutions, and also to examine the expectations of those individuals who come to us from outside the institution, and to see what their expectations are.

Today I would like to talk briefly about those institutional expectations from a university point of view and from the viewpoint of the individual student who comes to that institution and sees what interface exists.

Institutional Expectations

First, institutional expectations: (This is going to be quite general). These are areas we are trying to develop at the University of California on all the campuses (our attitudes toward minorities include Hispanics, Blacks, women, and so forth). What are the institutional expectations? What do we have in an institution of higher education? I think we all know that in American society our institutions of higher education were developed primarily by the white middle

*Dr. Tomás Rivera is Chancellor at The University of California at Riverside.

class, or students from the white middle class. Until quite recently, most university and college students have come from there.

I say quite recently, for the Hispanics, especially, because it was not until about twenty-five years ago that we really had the first great incursion (I do not use that word "incursion" in any pejorative sense) of Hispanics into institutions of higher education in this country; our progress, if minimal, has been because of this late entrance into the educational institutions of higher education. Until quite recently, most university and college students have come from the middle class, or have taken on some of its characteristics. I am talking about the middle class that did exclude, to a great degree, the Hispanic (most members of the faculty also came from the middle class.) This was true up through the Second World War. After the GI came back from the Second World War, we did experience a change.

All social institutions, including universities, reflect the assumptions of their societies. Although they, in turn, create value systems of their own in order to justify their own existence. I think we should question that attitude also. Although the United States has, throughout its history, been a nation of minorities, the overall assumptions which have guided it and its institutions of higher education, have emanated from a long standing tradition of Western European values. There is no question about that.

In the 1980s, however, we can expect these values to be called increasingly into question, as the dominate classes which have developed the institutional assumptions of our society will become, by the end of the decade, in many areas, numerically a minority.

Institutional Assumptions

I think it is incumbent upon all of us in higher education to understand the underlying assumptions behind and within our institutions. I am going to enumerate these. What are the assumptions that we have in higher education? Again, our assumptions are based on a collective social group of academicians, of administrators, and then, of course, of our staff.

These assumptions are:

- (1) Students are expected to become assimilated into a White middle class society.
- (2) Students will respond uniformly to objective bureaucratic rules and regulations.
- (3) Students come to the University with careers in mind and are prepared to set educational goals in ways the University stipulates.

- (4) Students are all adept at speaking and writing the English language. (I think we recognize that it is not true, but we assume that. Although we recognize there is something missing there, we still assume it should be that way.)
- (5) Students are prepared to accept a certain personality from the staff of the University.
- (6) Students are all prepared to understand both the formal and informal procedures of the University.
- (7) Students will be willing to seek out faculty and other advisors when they are made available.

Student Assumptions

Now what about the student assumptions? What do they assume when they come to the University? Their assumptions are, of course, of a more personal nature. Students' assumptions and their expectations are quite different from those that we have, as you can readily see. The history of minority students in American institutions of higher education has been, in essence, a dismal one. I do not use the word "dismal" with a continuing hand-wringing, pejorative attitude. I use it realistically. I think we have to recognize that it has been a dismal failure, and we have to make it better.

If we look at the Hispanic in higher education, the picture is still very dismal. We have made progress, but the progress has not been as great as it should have been. There do exist a number of factors that contribute to this. The Hispanic American has never had colleges or universities that could train him or her in great numbers. We do not have that; we did not have that in the past. The Hispanic community had to rely on existing universities and institutions of higher education.

The situation of minority youth in colleges and universities was determined initially by segregation laws and practices. Later the conditions and quality of education available to them in depressed areas or urban ghettos, etc., together with the socioeconomic conditions, dictated their circumstances. The socialization experience of minority students still takes place mainly in households and communities which are separated, for the most part, from the broader community.

I know that we have tremendous communications systems. It is easy to travel from different parts of a city or region to any part of our country. But the socialization process which takes place for the Hispanic is still not part of the broader majority community. The fact that parents of minority youth, for the most part, are not college graduates themselves makes it difficult for them to assist youngsters in any realistic preparation for their college experience,

except maybe by expressing, which is perhaps the most important thing, a great desire that they continue their education and by giving them their hope for continuing that education.

Student Expectations

What are the expectations of the students? Again, quite generally, the expectations that minority students bring to the university campus and the realities they actually experience can be grouped into five broad areas: (1) the faculty and staff; (2) the student body; (3) the social community at the university; (4) the administration and; (5) the academic areas.

First, The faculty/staff: (I am basing this on studies done at the University of California and the California State University system). Minority Students often come to the university with the expectation that they will encounter a faculty and staff consisting of highly trained educated persons who are less likely to be prejudiced or racist. This is what they expect. They hope the faculty and staff will be persons whom they can trust. They sense that in the academic community there is that high ideal. Too often the experience of minority students leads them to feel disillusioned, ignored, or disregarded.

Second, The student body: The minority students also hope their university peers will exhibit less of this prejudice or discrimination. They come to campus expecting cooperation and participation and an integrated experience. Often that is not the case.

Third, The social community: The minority students hope for a supportive social and community campus environment that will facilitate meeting new people and will provide a respite from what may be a large and impersonal campus. Especially in dormitories it is very, very difficult to establish a social relationship if you are from a minority community.

Fourth, The administration: Many minority students come to the university with a hope that the administration, which has often assisted them in the admission process, will continue to provide persons in authority who can help them with the campus. Again there is a certain disillusionment after they have been admitted.

Fifth, academic area: In the academic areas also, minority students enter the university with the expectation that the academic side of the campus will recognize their own personal worth, their minority history, personalities, culture, issues, as legitimate and desirable areas of focus, analysis, and research. In most cases they find that is not the case.

I wanted to interface, very briefly, institutional expectations with individual expectations for a basic reason. We are individuals

in academe, but we are also an element of a social group in our own discipline. The intent of social groups is quite different from the intent of each individual. I think we can see this readily as we look at the expectations of students and expectations of institutions.

If we look at what institutions expect, it is a social order of things. If we look at the individual expectations, it is a very, very personal thing that is desired. The students look up to the academic institutions for ideals even today. They look with very ideal expectations to the people in the university (faculty and administration) to provide them and give them ideals and moral guidance. They expect that.

Moral Issues

I believe we are more moral as individuals than we can ever be as a social group. I hope to leave one message here. As we discuss the role of the social scientists in CETA, Hispanics, etc., I hope you attempt to bridge the gap between an institution and an individual expectation. I do hope we can be concerned with moral issues as you develop all your studies, or as you develop any policy that has to do with human beings. Let us look at the moral issues.

When I became the chancellor at the University of California at Riverside, a lot of people were concerned. They had never heard of me; they were concerned for what might take place. But the basic concern was that the University of California at Riverside was an elitist institution, and here I was coming from a populous state university that does not have (supposedly) an elitist attitude. How could a Chicano, trained in Oklahoma, be president of UC Riverside?

After my first meeting with the academic senate, I was interested in seeing what the effect had been. One of the professors (a sociologist) came to speak with me about it and he said, "I heard something really funny, I'm going to have to tell you this, and I don't mean this in any derogatory way, but after the meeting one faculty member was talking to another one and he said, 'You know, I can understand why Governor Brown put a Chicano in as a Chancellor at Riverside for political reasons, but did he have to look so much like a Chicano?'"

The next day as I was walking across campus. I saw this fellow coming, running at me, kind of short and fat, running as hard as he could toward me. He rushed up to me and I braced myself. I did not know what he wanted and he look kind of desperate. He said, "Dr. Rivera, the day you were made Chancellor was the happiest day of my life." He went on, "because you were in humanities, and I'm a professor of Russian literature, and that's great." I said, "Well, we've got something in common." "But," he said, "when I saw you I really felt good." "Why?" I asked. He said, "Well, all of my life I had an inferiority complex, and when I saw you, I realized there was no

discrimination against short, fat people." I say this just to underline the basic human element we have in academe.

We are not simply robots; we are not simply people who take only from society. I think we have tremendous intellectual resources in our institutions. I think we have overabundant generosity which we nurture and provide to our students. We should, however, exercise the common expressions, behavioral expressions of acceptance and respect that we do in many cultures by providing a better "Abrazo" to the young men and young women who come to our institutions and expect great things from us. I think we owe them that, among so many things.

HISPANICS IN THE LABOR FORCE: A FEW MODEST SUGGESTIONS
ABOUT RESEARCH AND POLICY

Eli Ginzberg*

It is with a great degree of embarrassment and regret that I am asking my good friend, Howard Rosen, to read this introductory statement. My embarrassment stems from the fact that I have long prided myself that if I accept an invitation, as I did the invitation to be your keynote speaker, that I keep my word. And I generally do just that. But due to my failing to have both my '79 and '80 appointment books with me, I entered this date in my '79 book not realizing at the time that I had already committed myself to be in Holland on the same day. And even in a world of supersonic flight, I could not meet both commitments.

But I was not only embarrassed, I was also sincerely regretful about this mixup. It is a long time since last I visited San Antonio, and I was very much looking forward to a return visit--so much in fact that I had planned to bring my wife and spend some extra days in your midst. Further, I am exposed all too seldom to knowledgeable persons who are students of the multiple complexities that impact the Hispanic communities in the United States, and I looked forward to learning much not by talking but by listening. Further, I badly needed this exposure because the National Commission for Employment Policy, which I have the honor to chair, has decided that it would initiate studies in 1980 and intensify them in 1981 to probe the problems of Hispanic communities in depth with the aim of recommending to the President and the Congress--as we are called upon to do--a range of actions that could contribute to the more effective development and utilization of the country's second largest minority--well on the way to becoming the country's largest.

I hope that these few introductory comments will convince you of the sincerity of my early remarks. I personally feel a deep sense of loss in not being able to participate in person in what I am sure will be at one and the same time an exciting and illuminating conference.

To make myself feel a little less foolish about my scheduling mishap, I asked Dr. Furino whether I might ask my friend, Howard Rosen, to read a short opening statement which would in brief context

*Dr. Eli Ginzberg is Director of the Conservation of Human Resources at Columbia University, New York and serves as Chairman of the National Commission for Employment Policy.

outline for you a few points that I would have made, had it been possible for me to be present.

Your convenor informed me that the Conference would focus on two principal themes--CETA and Hispanics and a research agenda of the manpower problems of Hispanics. I will comment briefly on the former and say a little more about the latter. After all I have been chairman of the several advisory bodies on manpower of the federal government for 18 years and my research in human resources extends over 41 years which justifies the relative emphasis that I have determined upon.

CETA and Hispanics

With respect to CETA I would make the following summary comments:

1. CETA has only recently begun to target on the disadvantaged. One can go back to the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 part of which was directed to the disadvantaged, to Title II of CETA, passed in 1973, to the amendments in 1976. Prior to that time while considerable numbers of poor Whites, poor Blacks, and poor Hispanics were enrolled in one or another federal program, the fact remains that the more disadvantaged had a hard time to be included, and surely to be included commensurate with their need.
2. A second point that has long impressed me is that the legislators and administrators in Washington have a tendency to see the nation in rather simplistic terms. All minorities are more or less alike. Skin color may differ slightly, but the Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians are more alike than different. This has never made much sense to you--nor to me--but it has been a fact of life in Washington.
3. As you know, President Carter only the other day announced a new Youth Initiative--an extra \$2 billion dollars, not immediately but down the road. This has particular relevance for Hispanics who, as you well know, have the lowest average age of any major group and among whom the number and proportion of young people will not begin to drop until the latter 1980s, if then.
4. There is considerable ambivalence in most, perhaps all parts of the U.S. on the subject of bilingualism. That is surely the case in my part of the country--the Northeast. True, the school authorities have been officially converted, but my emphasis is on the term "officially." Frankly, I think that the issue is not as simple as some of the advocates or the opponents believe. Clearly, there is a great deal to be said for enabling any group to continue its traditions including its language and customs. But we are an English-speaking nation and even if the most extreme estimates of the growth of the Hispanic minority turn out to be true, the statement identifying English as our dominant language will hold. Two things follow therefrom: Youngsters in

school will be seriously handicapped unless they master English early and completely and unless adult members and potential members of the labor force are similarly competent. In any case, the point that I must stress in the context of CETA is that the ambivalence over bilingualism has probably resulted in an under funding of opportunities for Spanish speaking persons to learn English expeditiously.

5. CETA came into being for the explicit purpose of making local elected officials the responsible persons for allocating funds among the electorate in accordance with federal guidelines but clearly also with a sensitivity to the distribution of local political power. For the most part, Hispanic communities have been slow to organize and to enter the political arenas. It is not surprising, therefore, at least not to me, that they have frequently not shared on an equitable basis in the distribution of funds. For as I just pointed out, need, as defined by federal guidelines, is determined through the pulling and tugging of local competing groups for limited funds.
6. It is my impression that while Hispanics have been latecomers in developing effective CEOs and informing local political pressure groups, they are now on the way. If Congress stays with targeting--and I think it will--and with more money becoming available for disadvantaged youth, Hispanics should, as I see it, do better with the passage of time in the proportion of CETA funds to which they gain access. What I do not know is what will happen to the size of the total pot. Here the signs are less favorable.

So much for CETA and Hispanics about whom I know only a little. Now for the subject about which I supposedly know more--research in human resources. The trouble is that I have never studied Hispanics, and therefore, what I have to say is in the form of gleanings and extensions from my now four decades in human resources research. But I hope that at least some of my suggestions will be of help to you as you deliberate how best to move ahead.

Research Questions Worth Exploring

1. What are the important developmental and labor market experiences that are parallel and different among important Hispanic sub-groups such as the:

Puerto Ricans,

Those of Mexican extraction,

Cubans,

Those from South America?

Implicit in this question is the extent to which, language aside, these groups resemble or differ from each other in their preparation for and adjustment to the labor market. In my view, there is a great difference between the Hispanics of San Juan, Miami, and Houston.

2. What can one learn once one standardizes across these sub-groups for such critical variables, as age, length of time in the continental U.S., education, sex, and still other variables. How much of the emerging occupational and income differences remain to be examined and what clues can one think of that are worth pursuing?
3. What does one know and how can one find out more about the employment patterns among the following sub-groups in cities and towns near the Mexican border:

U.S. citizens,

Green card holders,

Illegals?

4. If one lined up some significant samples of Whites, Blacks, Hispanics--standardized and unstandardized as to characteristics --in a series of large labor markets such as L.A., Houston, Miami, Chicago, and New York, what could one learn about similarities and differences among these groups in different labor markets?
5. What are the implications of "propinquity" of Hispanics (from Mexico and Puerto Rico) that make Hispanics a different immigrant stream from European Whites and what are some of the important labor market related consequences that stem from this fact?

A Few Concluding Observations

1. I was an adult before I became conscious of any Puerto Rican minority in New York City. And as a student of U. S. labor, I knew of Mexicans in the U. S. only in terms of seasonal migratory workers. This means that migration patterns can and do shift rapidly and may do so again.
2. Even if one is skeptical about projections, and I am a big skeptic, I do believe that some attention must be paid to simulating the alternatives that may characterize the labor markets in 1980 and the year 2000 along the Texas to California and Mexico border. The focuses making for continuing large-scale flows across that border do not appear to me to be likely to be reduced significantly in the years ahead and may in fact increase.

3. There is a need to study in depth the socio-cultural adaptations of Hispanics to the Anglo world. It may be true, and then again it may not be the case, that Hispanics of the third generation are determined, more so than other immigrants, to remain closely linked to the culture of their grandparents. Surely this is a subject for study not blanket affirmation or contradiction.
4. Finally, I am sure that the deliberations of this Conference, which I repeat I deeply regret missing, will yield important insights and information that will stimulate the study of the labor market problems of Hispanics. I am sure that the National Commission for Employment Policy will profit greatly from your deliberations as it focuses a major part of its agenda in 1980 and 1981 on the Hispanic minority. I wish you all success in your deliberations.

POLICY ISSUES

HISPANICS AND CETA

Ernest Green*

I am glad to be here with you today, and I bring you warmest greetings from Secretary Marshall. He regrets very much that he was unable to come; but I can assure you of his fullest support for your efforts. When he was in this state and on up to the present, he demonstrated a deep commitment to improving the position of Hispanics in the labor force; and he is working very hard--as all of you are--to move this goal forward.

I am very impressed, you know, with the resourcefulness Texans always demonstrate, and I think nothing better illustrates this than one of the Secretary's tall Texas tales. It seems a Texan and another fellow were out hunting when a grizzly jumped out at them and reared as if to strike. The Texan quickly pulled a pair of sneakers from his knapsack and laced them up in two seconds flat. "What're you doing that for?" His pal shouted, "You can't outrun that grizzly." "It's not the grizzly I'm worried about outrunning," was the reply. "It's you."

Well, that was good quick thinking, which leads me to believe he must have been from San Antonio. At any rate, I know for sure you have resourcefulness, because this gathering demonstrates it. It brings together in one place leaders in the effort to learn more, and do more, to meet the employment and training needs of Hispanic people; and I challenge each of us to use this conference as a means of coming up with specific policies and practices which will enable us to do a better job.

We are now in the second year of our four-year institutional grant program for research and development, and the University of Texas at San Antonio is one of the key schools in this effort. Antonio Furino, Eugene Rodriguez, Lynda de la Vina, and the rest of the fine staff here are to be heartily commended for the excellent work they have done. Already we are coming up with important data in determining where the needs are, geographically and demographically; evaluating who can best meet those needs; and strengthening such programming aspects as affirmative action, bilingual training, apprenticeship, the school-to-work transition, and placement into high-paying growth occupations. During the course of this year, we expect

*Mr. Ernest Green is Assistant Secretary of the Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor.

to be able to synthesize this data into usable form, and the conference will contribute mightily toward that end. It is our pleasure to help support your efforts.

If I can do one thing as a keynoter, particularly as we address the topic of Hispanics and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, it is this: to urge each of you to explore ways in which you can initiate or increase your involvement with your CETA prime sponsor. As you know, CETA has largely succeeded in its purpose of decentralizing employment and training programs to the local levels where they belong. And now that we have redirected CETA toward its original objectives of targeting on Hispanics, other minorities, women, young people, and the whole panoply of the neediest work force segments, your close partnership with us is absolutely essential.

Here in San Antonio, for example, the prime sponsorship has become increasingly responsive to Hispanic needs. Much of the credit for this must go, of course, to Mayor Cockrell, who has also made her mark in the councils of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. There are many examples of this local responsiveness, but I would like to focus briefly on just one. The National Women's Employment and Education Project, which was developed here with the assistance of the Women's Bureau, was picked up by the prime sponsor for funding in this fiscal year and has become a model program of its type.

There is no question that CETA generally has been a primary factor in the progress which we have made, with your help, toward giving Spanish-speaking Americans the full job and training opportunities they deserve--and I do not need to remind you that progress for Hispanics is important for the whole nation. We will not have enduring prosperity in this country unless all major groups in our society share in that prosperity. We will never be able to achieve the objective that we have set for ourselves in the Labor Department and the Carter Administration of having full employment in the United States without having full employment also for Hispanics.

We also recognize that in order to get to full employment for Hispanics, we need special efforts to reach people who have unique characteristics before we can employ and train them to be productive. We, therefore, recognize the need for the institutions and organizations which you represent.

Our basic objective in the Department of Labor is to support a network of Hispanic institutions and organizations which can work with us in meeting the problems of Hispanics. We think that this is extremely important because we will not be able to build bridges between the Hispanic communities of the United States and the mainstream of employment opportunities without help from people who understand those communities and can help us build those bridges.

When President Carter took office, Hispanic Americans were the most underrepresented minority, not just in our economy but in the federal workforce. And Hispanics were not just underrepresented, they were also undercounted.

In the 1980 census, for the first time, Hispanic Americans will be counted as Hispanic Americans. These figures will help determine the size and scope of the challenges ahead and attract increased national attention to the seriousness of Hispanic unemployment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has significantly expanded its labor force information on persons of Hispanic origin, and the Employment and Training Administration is supporting, as here, research in Hispanic-American labor market problems and issues. By developing these factors with greater precision, we will get greater equity in the distribution of our resources. And since \$17 billion, for instance, is distributed on the basis of unemployment figures, we are talking about something which is extremely critical.

President Carter has appointed four times more Hispanic Americans to positions in his administration than in previous administrations. He has appointed 186 Hispanic Americans to date, as compared with 46 in the Ford Administration and 34 for the Nixon Administration.

At the Department of Labor, we have more than doubled the number of Hispanics employed to over 900. And we have more than doubled the number of professionals among that number, who now make up two-thirds of the total Hispanic work force.

The proportion of Hispanics has increased from 2.7 percent in 1977 to 4 percent now. With the Employment and Training Administration, it has gone from 3.6 to (close to) 5 percent. ETA has nearly 200 Hispanics, and again, two-thirds of them are professionals. I need only cite Dick Flores, our ETA administrator for this region; Fred Romero, ETA's deputy for Policy, Evaluation and Research; and Mike Vela, the assistant to my deputy Chuck Knapp, to emphasize that many of these professionals are in key policy making positions.

Of course, it is not enough for us to simply say that Hispanics are welcome to apply for jobs in the Department of Labor. We believe that it is our obligation to go out and actively recruit them and get them into key positions in the Department, and we urge you to help us with that important objective.

We are convinced that we cannot do our work well unless we have people in the Department who understand the problems of Hispanics and, therefore, can help us devise programs to reach them.

When President Carter took office, 509,000 Hispanics were out of work. The Hispanic unemployment rate was 11.7 percent, far above the national rate.

By last month, we had reduced the Hispanic unemployment rate to 9.1 percent, down by more about one fourth, and the growth rate of Hispanics in jobs has been significantly higher than the national rate. Now, 4 3/4 million Hispanic Americans are on the job--supporting themselves and their families, working toward a bright future, and aiding the prosperity of their country.

But none of us can be satisfied with an unemployment rate that is over one-third higher than the national rate. Nor can we be satisfied with a 5.9 percent national rate--despite the nine million new jobs added to our economy since President Carter won election.

That is why you are here today. That is why I am here: to continue our progress in creating jobs for our workers.

When in 1978--with your help--Congress passed the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, we gave new life to our goal of full employment.

We have reversed the dangerous idea of high unemployment as the price for economic stability. This idea is not only unsound economically, but also immoral, because it would have the most vulnerable members of our society--the working poor and chronically unemployed--bear the full costs of economic policy.

And this brings us right back to our new and more targeted directions under CETA. In the earliest years of the Act, only 45 percent of the participants were disadvantaged. When we came in, that figure was 63 percent. Today, it is 84 percent. Later this year, it is expected to be 94 percent. That is progress.

CETA has gone from \$2 billion to \$11 billion. It has gone from 85,000 Hispanic participants in 1974 to three quarters of a million now. It has steadily increased research and development expenditures for Hispanics to the point where they now make up 21 percent of the discretionary R&D budget. And it has channeled more and more resources to Hispanic organizations. SER, for instance, which has placed 150,000 Hispanics in jobs since 1966, is receiving some \$66 million a year from the CETA system, and we are establishing a SER-operated Job Corps Center in Laredo, Texas.

We are also convinced that we must increasingly shift emphasis to creating private sector jobs for the disadvantaged, since four out of every five new jobs come from that sector. Clearly, most private-sector jobs are with a future--a future that will not be at stake every time an appropriations bill comes before Congress.

We are already well underway on our two major private jobs efforts--the private sector initiatives program and the targeted jobs tax credit. By the end of this year, we expect that these two programs will have created about 200,000 job and training opportunities.

I invite you to get fully involved in our private sector initiatives program, which seeks to train workers within the firm that will hire them. That way, we can guarantee that these workers will get and hold jobs that are most needed in the community.

The most innovative aspect of this is the establishment of Private Industry Councils across the country. Composed of business, labor, and community leaders, these councils are helping to tie local CETA programs to the needs of local labor markets.

We committed \$75 million to start up the program last year, and an additional \$325 million is being requested this year. Some 400 councils are already established. A particular effort is being made to involve small and minority business--and I might add that in 1979 Hispanic contractors received nearly \$15 million in DOL business.

The targeted jobs tax credit is also in place now to help hire the disadvantaged. This provided up to a \$3,000 tax credit to companies for each hard-to-employ worker in his or her first year on the job.

Recently, as you know, President Carter announced a major new program to provide jobs and training for young people, particularly minority young people. "A mind is a terrible thing to waste," the President said, "And we will give our young people new hope for jobs and a better life in the 1980."

It is expected that the President's initiative will provide almost \$6 billion to serve some three million young people in 1982. The initiative will involve strengthened coordination between CETA and vocational education, and will emphasize increasing opportunities for older and out-of-school youth, establishing clear performance benchmarks, and consolidating several of the programs under YEDPA. It will build upon YEDPA's considerable accomplishments, including provision of services to thousands upon thousands of Hispanic young people and involvement of such Hispanic organizations as SER, Mexican American Unity Council, and La Raza.

Finally, we have before Congress a welfare reform proposal that emphasizes taking people off welfare, training them if necessary, and placing them in productive jobs.

Our proposal would include a major expansion of CETA--400,000 new position--and private sector programs. We expect it to help our 1 1/2 million people escape poverty and achieve self-sufficiency in the first year.

The sum of these new efforts is that we have within our grasp the means and the opportunity to reach full employment. But we cannot reach that goal with the kind of inflation we have now, and we cannot

reach it without paying close attention to the international aspects of the employment problem.

As you undoubtedly know, we in the Department of Labor and in the Carter Administration have been very much concerned about the problem of undocumented workers. President Carter is the first President in history to send to the Congress a bill to deal with that problem. We sent the bill up in 1977. It was one of the first things that this administration did.

We now believe that there are several things that we need to do to refine the legislation, and this refinement is taking place based on consultations that we have had all over the country. Ultimately, the legislation will be sent back to Congress.

I believe that we must recognize the need to legalize the undocumented worker situation. Most people do not recognize it, but the fact of illegality among undocumented workers is a more important problem than the numbers involved. What we have is a large group of people who are forced to live outside the protection of our laws, who are easily exploited, and who are frequently forced to work scared and hard and, therefore, to create damage for themselves as well as for their children and for the whole country. People who come into this country ought to come in with full rights and the ability to protect themselves in the labor market.

We must also be responsive to the legitimate concerns of most of the groups involved in this very complex and controversial process. We must be responsive to the legitimate concern of the employer to get a work force. We must be responsive to the legitimate concern among Hispanics about the problem of discrimination. We must be responsive to the concern among civil libertarians about the identification question. And we must be responsive to labor's concern about unfair competition created by foreign workers coming into this country.

It is easy to state the proposition that we ought to follow--that we ought to let workers come into the country to do work that we cannot find people to do here. But it is very difficult to develop the mechanisms to implement this. Finally, I think it is very important for us to consult with Mexico and work with Mexico in all our joint problems, as well as to work with the ascending countries wherever the undocumented workers tend to come from.

This is one of the most important problems that we face. I believe that we now have an opportunity for a humane solution to it, one that will meet the legitimate concerns of everybody. And I think that the longer we wait, the more difficult it might be for us to address this problem.

Another difficult problem we have had regards the enforcement of laws protecting this nation's five million migrant and seasonal farm

workers. The recent set of rules issued by DOL on this subject not only ends seven years of litigation, but also acknowledges the need for new programs and policies and makes the changes necessary to meet this need. These changes include a special committee to coordinate DOL dealings with farm workers, and I can assure you of my utmost efforts to make the changes work.

In conclusion, let me say this. Our nation learned long ago that government alone cannot do the job of restoring full employment and maximizing opportunity for the neediest groups. We need the help of your communities--communities which know the special problems of the people who live there.

With your help we can succeed. We can put this country back on the road to full employment, full use of our tremendous economic strength, and a bright future for all of our citizens.

CETA ISSUES AND IMPLEMENTATION¹

Harry Greenspan*

Since 1974, a small staff at the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences has been examining the implementation of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The findings in the seven reports issued since 1976 are based largely on information collected from a nationwide sample of 28 CETA prime sponsors. This paper, which draws on that continuing assessment, will cover three aspects of CETA:

- A very short review of the legislative background of CETA,
- A discussion of the implementation of CETA with particular attention to the public service employment programs which have had the lion's share of the funding in recent years,
- Identification of some of the important unresolved policy and implementation issues.

Legislative Background

CETA was enacted because the Democratic Congress was dissatisfied with the many separate and uncoordinated training programs that preceded it, and because the Republican administration, as part of its New Federalism, wanted to shift employment and training programs from the federal to local government.

Prior to CETA, separate federal fund allocations were made to each state for classroom training and for on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA), passed in 1962. Initially, the objective of MDTA was the training of unemployed or underemployed persons for new skills needed because of technological change. At first, MDTA was not directed at the employment problems

*Mr. Harry Greenspan is Research Associate for the Committee on Evaluation of Employment and Training Programs, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.

¹This discussion of CETA issues and implementation is based in large part on material prepared by William Mirengoff, Study Director for the Committee on the Evaluation of Employment and Training Programs, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. Mr. Mirengoff was originally scheduled to speak on the subject of this paper at the symposium but could not attend.

of low-income persons, who because of race, inadequate education and training, or other disadvantages, typically have difficulty obtaining employment at a wage that will lift their families out of poverty.

The other major precursor of CETA was the batch of employment and training programs authorized during the Johnson administration as part of the "War on Poverty." These were aimed at curing the unemployment and raising the income of persons in families with incomes below the poverty level. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized training and work experience for youth from low-income families who were in high school, or had dropped out, or needed summer employment. For adults, the training programs and work experience included such programs as New Careers, Operation Mainstream, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector, the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), and others. Each of these programs required a separate contract between the U.S. Department of Labor and a local agency such as a school system, community action agency, other nonprofit organizations, or local government. In most areas, the operation of several of the Economic Opportunity Act programs resulted in contracts with a number of different local agencies. Little or no effort was made to coordinate the different programs.

CETA, enacted late in 1973, was expected to rationalize the delivery of the separate employment and training programs previously authorized under MDTA and EOA. The rallying cry for the new legislation was "Decategorization and Decentralization." In place of separate federal grants for each categorical training program, a single flexible "noncategorical" block grant for employment and training would be provided. Direct contracting by the federal government with local program operators was to be replaced by decentralizing decisions on program activities to local governments who were designated as "prime sponsors" of the activities for their areas.

Early Implementation Effects

The initial implementation of CETA in fiscal year 1975 was a mixed success. Our study found that decentralization of administration and planning was largely achieved. About 450 prime sponsors established CETA administrative staffs, prepared comprehensive employment and training plans, and contracted with local agencies to operate program components. More than 80 percent of the initial CETA appropriations was allocated to prime sponsors.

Decategorization of program funds also was extensive in the early period. Two-thirds of the first appropriation for 1975 was allocated to prime sponsors on a decategorized basis--i.e., to use at their discretion for any of a wide variety of employment or training programs. Additional program funds were expected to be decategorized in future years.

In terms of management, delivery of services, and local participation, CETA was a better way of handling the nation's manpower programs than the earlier federal control of numerous categorical programs.

However, there were unexpected effects as well. The new uniform criteria for allocation of funds for comprehensive (decategorized) services to all jurisdiction of 100,000 or more population shifted some employment and training funds from the South to the Northeast and from large central cities to suburban counties.

Significantly, there was less emphasis on enrolling low-income disadvantaged persons--those who have the greatest difficulty in obtaining employment because they have limited education, because they are members of a minority group, or because they are young. The weaker commitment to the disadvantaged stemmed from three factors:

- Less restrictive eligibility criteria compared to the pre-CETA period,
- The spread of CETA resources to suburban areas which have lower proportions of disadvantaged persons,
- The inclination of prime sponsors to select those most likely to succeed rather than those most in need.

Although substantial decategorization was achieved by the 1973 CETA legislation, later actions by Congress added large categorical programs. The new programs reflected Congressional concern for the employment problems of youth; greater involvement of private industry in training and serving the disadvantaged; and the use of CETA public service jobs as a counter-cyclical program and as training for the structurally unemployed. Outlays of decategorized training services remained in the \$1.8 to \$2.0 billion range but declined from 58 percent of total in fiscal 1975 to about 21 percent of total in 1980. The youth programs, and particularly the counter-cyclical CETA jobs program, became a large part of a greater total.

The Counter-cyclical Period

Increasing unemployment soon after CETA was enacted shifted its major emphasis from employability development for the structurally unemployed to counter-cyclical job creation in government agencies and non-profit organizations. In December 1973, when CETA was passed, the unemployment rate was under 5 percent. A job creation program was included for areas with an unemployment rate of 6.5 percent or more under Title II of the Act, but the initial appropriation of \$400 million was only a sixth of the total authorized for CETA. By December 1974, the unemployment rate had climbed to 7.2 percent. Congress added a new counter-cyclical jobs program, as Title VI of CETA, and appropriated \$4 billion for public service jobs under Titles II

and VI. Continued high unemployment in the 1975-77 period led Congress to modify and expand the public service jobs program of CETA. By fiscal 1978, expenditures for public service jobs had grown to \$5.8 billion and were 60 percent of an enlarged CETA program. About three fourths of a million persons were in CETA public service jobs by March 1978.

Rapid expansion of CETA public service jobs was required to meet the objectives of the Economic Stimulus Act of May 1977. The expansion was successfully implemented by the CETA system with the number of persons in CETA jobs growing from 300,000 in May 1977 to 750,000 in March 1978. However, serious problems emerged.

- The most seriously disadvantaged--those with low-income, low education, and minority status--were not participating to the extent anticipated.
- Econometric studies found that high proportions of the CETA enrollees were used in place of regular local government employees, undermining the job creation effects of the program. Early estimates of the extent of substitution ranged from 30 to 90 percent. (A later, 1977, on-site analysis by the Brookings Institution of a sample of 41 governmental jurisdictions found a much smaller 19 percent displacement rate.)
- Reports of program abuses such as enrollment of ineligible, an absence of training, and "make-work" in place of useful activities created a poor public image of PSE.

To some extent, the problems reflected competition between the national objectives of serving the more seriously disadvantaged and creating additional jobs, and the concerns of local officials who may agree with the national objectives but also want the CETA jobs to provide essential public services and help avoid tax increases. Pressure from federal administrators on program directors to increase enrollment in order to attain counter-cyclical effects also accounts for inadequate representation among enrollees of the most disadvantaged.

The 1978 Amendments

In the 1978 reauthorization, which extended CETA for another four years, Congress amended the Public Service Employment titles and other parts of the Act to improve performance. To increase the share of public service jobs for persons whose need for labor market assistance is greatest, the criteria for participation were tightened. Enrollees now must be from families receiving federally supported public assistance or have low incomes and have been unemployed for 15 weeks (Title IID), or be low income and unemployed 10 weeks (Title VI). The 1978 amendments reduced the population eligible for CETA jobs from about 19 million to about 6 million.

The average wage for CETA public service jobs was reduced from \$7800 in 1978 to \$7200 in 1979, and supplementation of the CETA wage by employing agencies was sharply restricted. This was expected to make the jobs less attractive to persons who can compete in the regular job market, thus leaving them for the more seriously disadvantaged of those who meet the eligibility criteria.

The wage and eligibility restrictions were also expected to reduce the substitution of workers for regular government employees. The Act requires that CETA public service workers be paid the prevailing wages for similar work. The lower average CETA wages and the limits on supplementation narrowed the range of jobs available for CETA workers and reduced the opportunities for substitution. In addition, the enrollment of disadvantaged persons with few skills would make the CETA workers less attractive as substitutes for regular employees.

To improve the chances that participants in public service jobs would be able to transfer to unsubsidized jobs, Congress mandated that a portion of the funds for both Title IID and Title VI public service jobs be used for training and that employability development plans be prepared for all enrollees in the Title IID program for the structurally unemployed.

The 1978 amendments responded to reports of program abuse by requiring every prime sponsor to establish an Independent Monitoring Unit (IMU). The IMUs were given broad responsibilities to monitor compliance with the requirements of the Act and with the comprehensive employment and training plan prepared by the prime sponsor. Congress also required prime sponsors to develop plans for verifying the eligibility of participants and required the Department of Labor to intensify its review activities.

Effects of the 1978 Amendments

Our assessment of the impact of the reauthorized and revised CETA found that the major objective of the 1978 amendments--serving the more seriously disadvantaged--was being achieved. Compared to prior enrollees, new participants were more likely to be:

- Economically disadvantaged--from 80 percent of total enrollment before the 1978 amendments to 93 percent after,
- Younger (21 percent before; 23 percent after),
- Female (41 to 44 percent),
- AFDC clients (13 to 16 percent),
- Have less than a high school education (21 to 25 percent),
- Black (35 to 39 percent).

The 1978 amendments of greatest concern to prime sponsors have been the restrictions on wages for CETA public service jobs. CETA wages for new enrollees were reduced in 80 percent of the study areas by an average of 10 percent. Supplementation of the CETA wage, previously unrestricted, was eliminated for Title IID enrollees and sharply limited for participants under Title VI. The Act requires that CETA jobs pay the prevailing wage for similar work. Many types of jobs can no longer be used for CETA workers because the permitted CETA wage is now below the prevailing wage. After the wage restrictions became effective, fewer CETA workers were employed in professional, technical, administrative and craft jobs, whereas the share of jobs for laborers, clerical and service workers increased. A majority of the study areas cut back CETA jobs in police and fire protection activities and less support was also given to educational services. In their place a greater share of CETA jobs will be devoted to park and recreation area maintenance and development. Social services, largely provided through CETA jobs with local nonprofit organizations, also received relatively more support.

Local officials reported that the public services provided by CETA would be less useful than previously. The lower CETA wage narrowed the range of jobs that could be approved and resulted in a shift to lower priority activities. Lower wages and tighter eligibility screened out the more capable workers, and applicants for CETA public service jobs were considered less qualified than those of a year earlier in three out of four areas. Nevertheless, local officials emphasized that the CETA jobs continued to provide important public services in their communities.

The share of CETA public service jobs sponsored by nonprofit organizations increased sharply after the 1978 amendments from 24 percent of total in September 1977 to 34 percent in May 1979. The major factor was the greater flexibility of nonprofit organizations in meeting the lower wage requirements. The shift to nonprofit organizations will result in greater emphasis on the provision of social services for the poor and elderly.

Our study did not attempt to measure the effect of the 1978 amendments on the incidence of substitution. However, several changes indicate reduced substitution. These include the greater dependence on nonprofit organizations where substitution is less likely than in government agencies; the enrollment of higher proportions of youth and persons with low education who are less attractive as substitutes for regular employees in government agencies; the shift of CETA jobs from the primary government functions of public safety and education to park and recreation area maintenance; and the greater concentration of CETA enrollees in low-income jobs.

The independent monitoring units had not had much of an impact on program operations at the time of our survey. Most prime sponsors had carried on monitoring and evaluation activities prior to the 1978 amendments, and the staff for these activities had increased only by

one-seventh. However, our survey came only two months after the effective date of the provision--too soon for firm conclusions.

Changes, aimed at strengthening the CETA programs and ensuring compliance with national policies, have added new administrative tasks to a system already badly strained.

- Wage restrictions require the realignment of jobs and activities.
- Eligibility changes complicate the enrollment process and make it more difficult to recruit participants.
- Limits on length of enrollment require additional record systems.
- Developing training programs and employability development plans for all PSE workers is a major new responsibility.

Current CETA Issues

There are a number of important CETA issues that call for social science research. Improved understanding of those identified below would be of great interest to CETA administrators, Congress, and the public.

The public service jobs programs continue to absorb the lion's share of CETA funds. Restrictive eligibility criteria and low wages focus the programs on persons with few job skills. Is public service employment, even with the incorporation of a modest amount of job training, the most effective way to attack the problems of the structurally unemployed? Are other approaches such as intensive skill training, job search training, on-the-job training in private industry, basic education, or some combination of these methods more cost-effective?

Assessment of the effectiveness of CETA programs in increasing the employability and income of persons who have had poor success in the regular job market is still in an undeveloped state. Perhaps we are close to having preliminary national estimates of effectiveness through the control group comparisons of the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey now underway. But methods of estimating the effectiveness of local programs are elusive. How is performance of local prime sponsors to be assessed on a regular periodic basis since control group comparisons are seldom practical and since it is very difficult to standardize for local labor market conditions, participant characteristics, and the availability of training facilities?

In determining the cost-effectiveness of CETA public service jobs, how can the value of the services provided by the CETA workers be measured since they are provided without a market determined price?

Effective coordination of CETA activities with those of other local human services agencies remains a problem in many areas. Are the older established agencies prepared to meet the needs of the CETA population? For example, can local offices of the state employment service be expected to make special efforts to find jobs for the disadvantaged CETA trainees, or must prime sponsors set up independent job development and placement services for their clients? Similarly, are the established vocational education and other local training systems able and willing to meet the training needs of CETA enrollees? It is necessary and efficient for CETA to promote separate specialized training for its enrollees?

Finally, there is the important policy issue of public service jobs as a counter-cyclical program. If the long expected recession is deep rather than mild, and economic policy priorities shift from inflation abatement to counter-recessionary measures, should CETA public service employment be used again as counter-cyclical weapon? What are its advantages and disadvantages for that purpose compared to alternatives such as a tax cut or expanded money supply? How do CETA jobs and the other measures compare on quickness of response, ease of implementation, inflationary effects and the employment and earning opportunities for persons from low-income families?

CETA POLICY/IMPLEMENTATION REALITIES

William Mirengoff*

Introduction

I am delighted to be able to participate in what I believe will be an historic occasion. The University of Texas at San Antonio is to be commended for perceiving the need for such a gathering and the great potential that this symposium holds for Hispanics and indeed all social scientists.

I take as my text some of the topics identified in the Symposium announcement. Specifically, I will try to cover four aspects of CETA:

1. Legislative background,
2. Program assessment or "CETA Policy and CETA Realities",
3. The experience of Hispanics in CETA, and
4. Unresolved issues and the opportunities for social science research.

Legislative Background

The immediate antecedents of CETA were the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964, and, to some extent, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. The decade of the sixties was characterized by severe social tension, the discovery of the disadvantaged, and an explosion of social and economic programs aimed at improving their condition. However, disenchantment with the duplication and confusion surrounding these programs soon set in and set the stage for the next phase in the evolution of employment and training programs.

CETA, enacted in 1973, reflected the confluence of two major influences: one pragmatic, the other ideological. The Democratic Congress was dissatisfied with the patchwork of uncoordinated programs and sought reform; the Republican administration was committed to the philosophy of the New Federalism and sought to decentralize federal

*Mr. William Mirengoff is the Study Director for the Committee on the Evaluation of Employment and Training Programs, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.

programs through block grant funding. In terms of objectives, however, CETA was not different from its predecessors. Its purpose continued to be the improvement of the employability of persons who, because of lack of skills, education, and other handicaps, have special difficulty in the labor market. What is different is the system through which these objectives are to be accomplished.

CETA shifted control over a multi-billion dollar system which encompassed about 20 separate programs from federal to state and local control and consolidated the separate categorical programs into a single block grant that local communities could use in flexible fashion to meet local needs. What were the consequences of the new employment and training system on programs, places, and people?

Early Outcomes

Our assessment of the first year (1974-1975) of CETA experience indicates that:

1. The decentralization and decategorization objectives were, in part, realized. However, several categorical programs remained and there continued to be considerable federal presence. CETA, by its ambiguity, has created a large gray area where the grasp of the "locals" contends with the reach of the "feds."
2. In terms of management, delivery of services, and local participation, CETA was a better way of handling the nation's manpower programs than the earlier central, categorical system.
3. There was no significant change in the kinds of employment and training programs largely because ongoing programs tended to be continued.
4. The distribution of employment and training resources shifted: from the South to the Northeast and from large cities to counties.
5. With the shift of control to local officials, existing institutional relationships have been scrambled, and this led to a vigorous struggle for turf.
6. Last, but perhaps most important, there was a weakening of the commitment to the disadvantaged which reflected several influences:
 - a) Looser eligibility requirements compared to pre-CETA requirements,

- b) The spread of CETA resources into suburban areas, which have lower proportions of disadvantaged persons,
- c) Inclination of prime sponsors to select persons most likely to succeed rather than those most in need.

The Counter-cyclical Period

A. Background

CETA was barely launched when it was overtaken by the recession of 1974. Congress responded by adding a counter-cyclical public service employment program (PSE) which authorized the use of CETA funds to create jobs for the unemployed in state and local governments. The PSE program started modestly but, by 1978, had grown to 750,000 participants to become the major component of CETA, overshadowing the original structurally oriented programs.

B. Problems

CETA proved capable of absorbing the PSE programs but several intractable problems emerged:

1. Inadequate participation by persons on the lower rungs of the socioeconomic ladder,
2. Use of CETA funds for activities that otherwise would be supported by local resources,
3. Allegations of program abuses which created a poor public image of PSE.

Some of these problems reflect the inherent difficulties, in a decentralized program, of achieving congruence between national objectives and the priorities of local officials who administer the programs. And they have been aggravated by ambiguous legislation, competing statutory objectives, and the pressure for speedy program implementation. The 1976 amendments to CETA attempted to deal with some of these chronic problems, but with indifferent results.

C. Congressional Actions

The CETA amendments of 1978, which reauthorized the CETA legislation, is the most recent effort to address the shortcomings of the PSE program and appear to be the most effective. They were intended to:

1. Increase the share of PSE jobs for persons whose need for labor market assistance is greatest,

2. Constrain the use of PSE as a substitute for positions that otherwise would be supported by local funds.
3. Supplement PSE jobs with training and other supportive services to improve the changes that participants will "make it" in the competitive labor market.
4. Eliminate program abuse.

To achieve these purposes, the new provisions of CETA require:

1. Tighter income and unemployment criteria for participation in PSE.
2. Restrictions on PSE wage levels.
3. Limits on the length of stay in PSE jobs.
4. Establishment of independent monitoring units to police the program.

In assessing the impact of the new provisions of CETA we found that:

1. The overriding objective of the CETA amendments--to serve more fully those whose needs are greatest--is being achieved. New enrollees compared with their earlier counterparts appear to be:
 - a) More economically disadvantaged (80-93%),
 - b) Younger (21-23%),
 - c) Include more women (41-44%) and AFDC clients (13-16%),
 - d) Have less schooling (21-25%), and
 - e) Are more likely to be Black (35-39%).
2. The new eligibility verification requirements will reduce the number of ineligible entering the program. Moreover, by fixing the liability for improper enrollments on the prime sponsors, program managers have become much more sensitive to problems of program abuse. There is, however, a danger that the preoccupation of policing the programs might divert attention from the programs' objectives.
3. With respect to effectiveness of independent monitoring units, our survey suggests that the initial impact was

not very significant. Virtually all independent monitoring unit heads are appointed by and responsible to the CETA administrators, which raises some question as to the degree of their independence. However, our survey was conducted only two months after the effective date of the provisions--too soon to draw firm conclusions.

4. No provision of the reauthorization act caused more consternation among prime sponsors than the restrictions on PSE wages. PSE workers are required to be paid prevailing wages for comparable government positions. But because the new PSE wage levels may be below prevailing levels in some jurisdictions, sponsors are having difficulties in establishing PSE positions. Average wage rates have been lowered in four out of five areas--by an average of 10 percent. This was accompanied by a shift from high skill positions to laborer, clerical, and service jobs. Police and fire protection jobs have been particularly affected.
5. Despite these changes, CETA administrators still perceive PSE activities as useful--but three out of four feel the usefulness has been reduced.
6. Similarly, 68 percent of the CETA administrators rated the performance of PSE workers as "about the same" as regular workers. The remaining 32 percent rated them "below average." This view of PSE participants is less favorable than the one held in 1977.
7. We have not attempted to measure the extent to which the new amendments have constrained substitution. There is, however, some basis for inferring that the new legislation has reduced the temptation of prime sponsors to substitute. This is suggested by the kinds of changes that are taking place in services, jobs and participants.
8. One clear consequence of the new amendments, particularly of the wage changes, has been to increase the role of nonprofit organizations. They have been able to accommodate more easily to the new wage requirements. The proportion of enrollees in programs operated by these organizations increased from 22 to 32 percent.
9. The redirection of the CETA program has exacted a price. Most of the changes, aimed at strengthening the program and ensuring compliance with national policies, have added a host of new administrative tasks to a system already badly strained.

- a) Wage restrictions require the realignment of jobs and activities.
- b) Eligibility changes complicate the enrollment process and make it more difficult to recruit participants.
- c) Tenure limits require complicated participant tracking systems.
- d) Developing training programs and employability development plans for all PSE workers is an extremely complicated and costly process.

Hispanics in CETA

Let me now turn to the role of Hispanics in CETA.

First, program participation. The proportion of Hispanics in all CETA programs has remained relatively constant at 13 percent over the past three years. In 1978, the share of PSE jobs that went to Hispanics was 9.0 percent, and the proportion of Hispanics among the unemployed was 7.2 percent.

Second, job placement. Hispanics were 13 percent of total Title I participants and 13 percent of all placements from those programs. However, in the PSE programs, Hispanics job placement rates were significantly lower than their participation rates (IID, 13 versus 7.8 percent; VI, 11.6 versus 6.6 percent).

Third, program funding. There has been a significant increase in the funding of SER-sponsored programs, from 13 billion dollars in 1974 to 19 million dollars in 1976 and 70 million dollars in 1978. SER now has contracts in 113 areas.

Fourth, changes in labor force status. The post-program labor force status of Hispanics was similar to that of other participants three months after termination, 75 percent were reported to be employed.

Fifth, changes in earnings. Similarly Hispanic gains in annualized earnings during the first quarter after termination from CETA were in line with the experiences of all enrollees, 153 percent of their pre-CETA earnings.

Sixth, participant characteristics. The proportion of Hispanic participants in CETA differ from that of other enrollees in several significant respects:

- a) There were more males,
- b) They were younger,

- c) More economically disadvantaged,
- d) More likely to be heads of households, and
- e) Considerably more likely to be migrant and seasonal farm workers (10 times more likely).

Open Issues

Finally, I would like to identify several broad policy issues. Since the passage of the Emergency Employment Act in 1971, the nation has become increasingly committed to public service employment as an instrument for social and economic policies. This commitment may grow in the face of increasing unemployment and proposals for welfare reform. There are, however, several policy questions which must be addressed and which offer a fertile field for social science investigation.

A. Limits of PSE

PSE has been pressed into service for a variety of purposes: combatting recession, assisting the structurally unemployed, local economic development, the jobs' component of welfare reform, provision of essential services, not to mention fiscal relief. At issue is whether CETA can be driven in all directions at once.

B. Wage and Eligibility Issues

1. Wages

Do PSE wages provide sufficient incentive to induce transfer payment recipients to accept PSE jobs? What are the opportunity costs? If AFDC clients were enrolled in PSE program in proportion to their share of the eligible population, they would comprise half of all enrollees instead of the present one-sixth.

2. Eligibility

Will the present eligibility requirements produce a pool of eligible persons large enough to support an expanded counter-cyclical program, should one become necessary?

C. Congruence

The underlying premise of a decentralized program is that national objectives are congruent with local practices. In fact, there are significant divergences. CETA is a meld of national, state, and local aspirations implemented by an array of federal, state, and local institutions. Each partner in the triad is motivated by its own interests and attempts to shape the program

to those ends. However, local deviation from national objectives invites restrictive legislation and tighter compliance measures, which narrow local flexibility. The research question is defining an equilibrium point which balances federal and local goals and relationships.

D. Multiple Goals

The congruence problem is compounded by the fact that CETA is liberally sprinkled with objectives, many of which are competitive and contradictory. The pursuit of one may preclude the attainment of others. In effect, CETA has established a host of deities to whom local officials must pay homage. However, in making offerings to one, others may be offended. And since they cannot all be placated at once, the local sponsors are always in difficulty with some. Here we need a theologian to establish a proper hierarchy among the deities.

CETA POLICY-IMPLEMENTATION REALITIES

Panel: Pedro Garza, Roy Escarcega, and
Ms. Lupe Anguiano. Moderator: Henry Cisneros*

Henry Cisneros: It is a pleasure to be with you in the dual capacity of academician and local elected official.

The Mayor, this morning, issued a welcome. I would like to repeat that on behalf of the members of the City Council. Welcome, each and everyone of you to our community.

We are very proud of what is happening here. We believe we are putting together the team that can assemble the best manpower delivery program, the best employment training package in the nation. We are consciously striving, and have been for the last four years, toward the day when we can run an advertisement in a national magazine designed to make business and industry look hard at the city with the best integrated training programs from high school vocational curricula to CETA manpower programs to technical and advanced education. We are approaching that day and we are very proud of what we have done. We realize how important economic development is and we have made a major effort in that area, but if economic development is not linked back to a flexible, practical manpower system, then it will benefit someone other than the people who most need the jobs. We have seen that experience repeated over and over across the country and we have vowed to ourselves that it is not going to happen in San Antonio.

So, it is a pleasure to be here both from the perspective of an academic who teaches courses in human resources, labor economics, and manpower policy at The University of Texas and also as one who has served as chairman of the Manpower Planning Council as part of my City Council duties. Manpower and economic development issues have been a great experience for us. The entire program is something I am very proud of. It is a particular pleasure to be here today to welcome you to San Antonio--as persons who are colleagues and who are interested in the same subjects as we who are trying to advance San Antonio.

*Mr. Pedro Garza is National Director of SER-Jobs for Progress, Mr. Roy Escarcega is member of the National Commission for Employment Policy, Ms. Lupe Anguiano is President of the National Women's Employment and Education, Inc., and Dr. Henry Cisneros is Assistant Professor in the Division of Environmental Studies at The University of Texas at San Antonio and Councilman, the City of San Antonio.

Pedro Garza: Again, I'm glad to have been invited to participate with you in this Symposium, particularly as we rub elbows with social scientists of Hispanic origin. It seems that SER and Hispanic social scientists came of age in the 70s. Dr. Santos, Dr. Cardenas, Dr. Tienda, Dr. Miguel Hidalgo--we simply did not have them in the late 60s or the early 70s. And, as we have come of age, and as we have developed together, I think that we have started to work together as a team, trying to impact national employment and training policies. So, I welcome the opportunity to be with you today.

One of the questions raised in the materials for the Symposium is "What is the Role of Social Scientists in the CETA Structure?" One role I would suggest is that we help educate the more established academicians such as Dr. Ginzberg, who apologized for not knowing more about Hispanics and CETA in his paper; and, of course, Mr. Mirengoff, who in preparing a paper on Hispanics and CETA (eleven pages), has one page devoted to Hispanics and CETA, and that one page is more descriptive, simply a status report, rather than being analytical.

I think as Hispanic social scientists academicians, we have the very important task of trying to make some of the more established people or authorities in the field of employment and training somewhat more responsive to the Hispanic worker. And in that regard, I would like to invite Dr. Ginzberg and Mr. Mirengoff, Dr. Sar Levitan and Garth Mangum, Dr. Greenspan, and Dr. Rosen to our annual conference in Washington, D.C., April 8-10. We will be focusing on Hispanic Youth, Hispanic Women, and the private sector. We have the invitations out, and I believe we will be working with Gene in the course of this Symposium to be sure that we have all of your names, and all of your addresses, so that you, too, can get an invitation and hopefully participate in this Conference.

The question is how has CETA affected the Hispanic--or what are the differences between CETA and MDTA? How have Hispanics fared?

Back in the barrio we used to say "El que tiene mas saliva come mas pinole." [The largest share goes to the most capable.] That certainly has been true here in CETA.

We think that how we have fared is less a function of the system we have been participating in than a function of the growth and development of Hispanos as an identifiable community. Time and again, I have noticed that CETA performance has been more a function of the individuals, the staff persons in charge, than the system itself. Certainly, the CETA administration in Washington, under Dr. Marshall, and Ernie Green, Lamon Godwin, and others, has been a totally different team than what we have had under the Republican administration. It is the same legislation but totally different results.

Certainly, CETA in San Antonio, under a Narciso Cano, again one of the finest that Texas A & M can offer, has been much different from

the very same system of CETA in south Texas Cameron County, where at one time the man responsible for CETA remarked that he did not believe in CETA. He did not think that the federal government should be meddling in employment and training; but the money was there, and so he was going to manage a program.

Again, individuals given the same set of rules, the same laws, the same constraints, receive totally different results. So, "si queremos comer pinole," [if we want our share] what kind of recommendations can we make, again as CBOs, and as academicians.

First off, I would like to add to what Roy Escarcega had to say. If we look at Congress and if we look at the committees and the representation of those committees, we would note that the key people come from the North, and the Northeast, the key industrial and union states. It is not surprising then that the allocation formulas work against cities of the Sun Belt and other cities where Hispanics are concentrated. Our first task, it seems to me, as we get involved in our communities, is insuring that some of our Congressmen and Congresswomen wind up in key committees in Labor and Education. Of course, we have to work for two-year funding, and we have to work for changing allocation formulas. We have to look at increased roles for community-based organizations. And "como siempre" [as always], more money.

When we go to the prime sponsors, there are about three areas that we would look at. One is enforcement of the legislation. Too many times we see sweetheart-type arrangements between the prime sponsor staff and Department of Labor officials. There is just not enough, it seems to me, being done by the Department of Labor to insure compliance with regulations and with legislation. There have been any number of instances where prime sponsors have over a long period of time been labeled marginal performers, again, with no punitive action of any sort taken by the Department of Labor.

Now, CBOs do not have that kind of luxuries. If SER or TELACU, or OIC, or Urban League is not performing, right off the bat we are not funded. We do not have our contracts renewed. But we have prime sponsors that continue to be marginal performers with really no action of any sort being taken. So enforcement certainly seems to be the key area that we need to be looking at.

It seems to me that there is a need to document better exactly what is a good performance by a prime sponsor.

Third, we have the area of training and technical assistance. One of the key areas I think is staff training and development. There is too much time being spent on interpreting regulations, and not enough in preparing the job developers, the counselors, the instructors, to be able to deliver better those key services to the participants. We need to focus more on the people that are actually up there on the front line delivering services.

It seems to me that we need to emphasize again high cost services. Because of the high cost, very needed services, again if we are talking about those most in need and if we are talking about Hispanos, we need skill training, we need on-the-job training (OJT), we need classroom training such as English as a second language (ESL), but all of these are high cost elements, and nobody wants to get involved in them.

Another thing that I would like to see emphasized is sub-contracts. It seems to me that proper role of the prime sponsors would be in the planning, in the area of fiscal controls, in the management information area, training and technical assistance--but not in the operational area. Why prime sponsors would want to operate their own programs is really beyond me. You have a number of agencies--the school districts, the skill center, the community-based organizations, who live and die by the types of services they provide the clients. Contract these organizations; that is what they are for; monitor them, evaluate them, and keep fiscal control, MIS control perhaps. But again, in terms of areas for study, areas for research, areas for trying to have some kind of policy impact, those would be my recommendations.

Roy Escarcega: I can not tell you how happy I am to be here to speak on my favorite subject: CETA and the prime sponsor system of funding. For a long time early in the enactment of the bill and the implementation of CETA programs, I took issue with the mechanisms at the local level and the theories, the studies, and the methods used to create an apolitical system that is totally politically responsive and that is not an inconsistency. That is what we have. After two years experience at the national level, it is significant now to temper my statements with a little bit of reason and a little bit of rationale, so that really I have to be less critical of the CETA system. But certainly I take a position, which we all should take, to be very, very mindful of its activities and mindful of monitoring to make sure that the prime sponsor does what it is supposed to do.

The CETA of the present prime sponsor system is one that, for all its good points and for all its bad points, is the combination of a lot of activities and thoughts so that an effort, I think, is being made by the Department of Labor to implement a reasonable, rational approach to giving out monies to take care of the problems of the poor. If you are in a city like San Antonio, that is not a problem because you have reasonable people, you have sound ethics, you have a political structure that is somewhat cognizant of values. If you are in an area that is politically active where the mayor sees this as a chance to use patronage, as a chance to make political payoffs to abuse the system, we know that situation can prevail.

If you are in an area where you are a minority (and for years that minority is not one that has been in favor), all of a sudden you

operate a community advocate program, which has been fighting the power structure and fighting the system. And you are expected to waltz up to city hall and say, "Look, I am here to serve the community, here is my program, evaluate me, and I will start implementing the program." We know that is not realistic. In order to do this or not to have this happen, we have local councils being created.

The local councils, again, are supposed to be unbiased, objective, and not react to the political environment, and we know that is an impossibility. So, we have to accept some things. I would like to focus in on some very, very present day aspects of CETA prime sponsor systems that I see as some problem areas.

One, the present system of allocation calls for a fixed funding system that is annual. I think that we have all talked about "Formula" funding, and we see some prime sponsor naturally moving towards that. Presently, there is little or no provision for creative programming. Once the system is placed, it is based upon what was the expenditure the year before. If a project, whether it is a school system or a university or a CBO, tries to implement a newer, more, creative project, locally it can not be done. There is an alternative: the state has a 4% discretionary fund which can be used only once.

Their conflict is even the prime sponsor saying to the state, "Look, do not fund that group; tell them to go to the Prime", and this is what happens. The allocation system got by us. I say got by us because in the implementation of the CETA system, I am not so sure that all of us were aware of the formulas and the way the allocations were made. And I think that we had a fast one pulled on us in 1973 and 1974. I know we did in Los Angeles. And the formula used did not take into account the complete population of the barrio or East Los Angeles or Hispanics. I think that now since we have a census coming up, you as scholars, as academicians should take it upon yourselves to make sure this Symposium comes out with a strong statement and focus on data reflecting a formula which takes us all into account. The present formula makes no provision for this.

I have one recommendation, based upon our present system. And being a practitioner at the local level, I see this as a reality. I would like to leave you with an idea, a concept which I think can be somewhat implemented. I believe that in public employment and public service (and we talk about 16 billion dollars going to the community, whoever that is), we need formulas to make sure that we get our count in and we are counted up. I think it is important that the CETA system make some provision for that prime sponsor's allocation to be used and to be designated on a discretionary basis by the regional office.

I think that when we have public education, when we have public employment programs, despite who may be running them, there has got to

be some sort of a check and balance. And I am thoroughly convinced that we should have some sort of competitive system, and I call it competitive alternatives. I take issue with the present Office of Education, and what they are proposing. There are no competitive alternatives. The school systems are put in place because they are there, not because they are doing a good job. We, as advocates on the Hill, are saying, "Look, they are getting more money to do what they are not supposed to do and that is not educating people." They say that they are not there to learn people, they are there to teach people.

I think in every system of public service there had better be competitive alternatives. Just because public institutions are in place does not necessarily mean that they are entitled to continue operating even though we do not have proper monitoring systems. The present bill in Education does not provide any local teeth, does not provide for any enforcement system for the new Youth Program. I take issue with that, and I express that everywhere I can. I think that you should look at the new bill. I think you should look at the way the approaches were taken. The Administration is presenting a very, very sound package but it implies that with the discretion of the superintendent will decide if he is going to take into account minorities and poor people.

Again, the formulas are important. We now are entering an area where it is important that each of you take a look at each local system to make sure that contracts are being complied with, to make sure the allocation formulas are being used. I can not do it. I am operating and trying to take care of keeping the door open. I would say to you that this is something that could come out of this Symposium: an intern program where key CBOs could be identified to take young scholars and put them into the forefront of exposure so that they see the day-to-day problems.

Presently, the system does not make any provisions for anything like that. We have rules that are in the regulation. We cannot take the time as implementors to close our doors and wait for a logical conclusion to come from the Regional Office or from Washington. We have got to keep our doors open and continue operating and training people for employment. Academically, we cannot look at things that are done and that are going to change the law. We have got to have two efforts--one from the Hispanic academic community and our effort at the local level. With that, I would like to conclude my remarks.

Lupe Anguiano: The 1980 census count and the large number of women entering the U.S. labor force are and will continue to have major impact on the employment patterns of Hispanic women. According to a U. S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau report, Hispanic women are not a homogeneous ethnic group in the United States, and gains in labor force activity were not shared equally among the different

Hispanic groups. Of the Hispanic ethnic groups for which data are tabulated separately, women of Mexican origin account for the largest proportion of Hispanic women working or looking for work, 57 percent, followed distantly by women of Puerto Rican origin, 11 percent, and those of Cuban origin, 9 percent. Therefore, the overall employment situation for Hispanic women largely reflects that of women of Mexican origin. In addition to differences by size, considerable variation among the major ethnic groups exists in virtually all employment related characteristics. Persons classified by Hispanic ethnicity are also classified according to race--Black or White. According to the 1970 Census, 96 percent of the Hispanic population group was counted as White.

The labor force participation rate measures the work force attachment of a population. Among all women of Hispanic origin, 48 percent participated in work activities, somewhat lower than the rate for all women at 51 percent. The total obscures differences in participation among the various ethnic groups and mainly reflects the lower rate of women of Puerto Rican origin compared with other Hispanic ethnic groups. At 35 percent, women of Puerto Rican origin posted the lowest labor force participation rate in 1979 compared with a high of 55 percent among women of Cuban origin. Part of the answer for these lower rates among Puerto Rican women may lie in the traditional role of women in the family. Women of Puerto Rican origin had higher fertility rates and lower educational attainment compared with women of Cuban origin among whom the reverse was true. Yet, women of Mexican origin, who had more children in their families than Puerto Rican and other Hispanic women, posted a labor force participation rate of 48 percent in 1979, close to that of all women, and considerably above that of women of Puerto Rican origin. Probably of more significance than traditional family roles are the divergent age distributions which have a strong effect on labor force participation. Women of Puerto Rican origin are younger compared with other Hispanic ethnic groups, reflecting the continued movement of young people to the United States from Puerto Rico.

The Hispanic women's labor force expanded by more than 300,000 between 1976 and 1979, reaching 1.7 million who were working or looking for work by 1979. The labor force gains largely reflect the expansion in employment to 1.6 million in 1979. Women of Mexican origin accounted for a greater than proportional share of the gain in employment--more than 70 percent of the increase, compared with about 60 percent share of the labor force. On the other hand, unemployment, moving down from recession highs, was still higher than that for all women, but somewhat lower than that posted by nonwhite (largely Black) women workers. At 8.9 percent in 1979, the jobless rate ranged from a low of 7.9 percent among women of Cuban origin, to a high of 9.9 percent among women of Mexican origin, not too much different from that of 9.3 percent for women of Puerto Rican origin.

Women of Hispanic origin were employed in blue-collar occupations to a greater extent than other women. Regardless of ethnicity,

employed Hispanics were more concentrated in lower paid, lesser skilled occupations than the overall work force. More than half of the employed women in each ethnic group were either clerical workers or non-transport operatives in 1979. Although the large percentage of Hispanic women employed in clerical positions is similar to the situation among all women, their heavy concentration in operatives jobs--dressmakers, assemblers, machine operators, and operators of similar equipment--is strikingly unlike other women.

My estimates are that 80% (perhaps over 85%) of Hispanic women are in the labor force because of economic necessity. They are heads of households--either divorced, separated, widowed, single, or their husbands earn less than \$8,000.00 a year.

Generally, government employment programs have failed to address the needs of the Hispanic worker as a whole in terms of documentation, need assessment, training, impact, projection, evaluation, and more seriously policy. Within this reality, the Hispanic woman is even further neglected.

Many of us look to the impact of the 1980 census to provide our country with data which will demonstrate gross neglect and the realization of our strength in terms of population. This realization will, I believe, have a major impact in the development of new policy in the area of Hispanic employment questions. I, however, feel that we are already making an impact on policy. In San Antonio, for example, we have succeeded in electing a sufficient number of Mexican Americans to public office and also placing a good number of them in important employment related policy positions.

A general review of CETA training programs as they affect the Hispanic woman will show two factors--first, CETA training programs service women, including women who are heads of households with young pre-school children, as they do everyone else; in other words, no special provisions are made for child care. The U. S. Department of Labor WIN program (Work Incentive Program), which is supposed to assist women heads of households who are on welfare, enter the labor market, does provide child care, but as a general rule, does not provide skills training. They merely refer women to existing jobs through what WIN calls the "self directed job search or Job Clubs approach". Perhaps some of you do not realize that the WIN program by statute is not allowed to focus on skills training. The Talmage Amendment passed by Congress restricts the WIN program to merely providing job placement.

The WIN program in my judgement is one of the most ineffective programs in existence. It is the program which most affects women yet serves them inadequately. I have made many attempts to provide Congress with sufficient reasons to discontinue the WIN program or phase it into the CETA program.

Many CETA prime sponsors have failed to develop an effective approach to serve welfare recipients because they rely on the WIN program.

Other factors that hinder Hispanic women from obtaining and retaining employment are what one might call cultural barriers and stereotyped notions. Cultural barriers can be described as career related factors causing women to lack incentives due to their Hispanic family living patterns. Strong Hispanic family bonds have a tendency to place great emphasis on the mother as the key family figure at home sustaining and nurturing family unity. A view of a "career mother" is almost unheard of in a typical Hispanic family.

Society's stereotyped notions are perhaps the most difficult to combat. An example of what I consider to be a prevalent stereotype of the Hispanic women can be seen in the movie "Children of Sanchez" where the Mexican woman-mother is depicted as the family corner stone to the point of complete selflessness, or self-sacrifice or even self-annihilation. Another stereotyped notion of Hispanic women is the prevalent view that Hispanic families are more intact--that is the popular belief that there are fewer divorces--family separations, etc., among the Hispanic families. According to census statistics, 14% of American families are headed by women, 14.1% of Hispanic families are headed by Hispanic women.

Currently, American women comprise 42% of the United States labor force, one million women are entering the labor force each year. According to an Urban Institute projection, the '80s will show that over 55% or 60% of all American women 16 years and older will be working--comprising 48% or even 50% of the U.S. labor force. You can be sure that as more and more American women enter the labor force, the Hispanic women will be among them. They will be perhaps in greater need to work than others because of the low income and wage earning standards of all Hispanic workers.

I would like to close by stating that Hispanic women are entering non-traditional jobs. This is no longer a rarity as many would think. In our National Women's Employment Program, we have helped 30 Chicanas enter construction jobs and many of them are now certified heavy equipment operators. What attracts Hispanic and other women to non-traditional jobs? The answer is good paying wages. About 50% of the women who come to our program seeking employment want non-traditional jobs.

Questions and Answers

Q: (Cisneros) This question has to do with Section 303, Title III Grantees and whether or not there is any movement toward decentralizing that system. The question is for Mr. Greenspan.

A: (Greenspan) First let me say that I have not been with the Employment and Training Administration for about the last six years. I am really not up on the current thinking on that particular topic. There may be other people in the audience here from the Department of Labor who may have some information on that topic, but I do not.

A: (Romero) As far as I know there is no thinking whatsoever in changing any of the National programs in terms of structure or what is already the law.

A: (Cisneros) Well, the answer is that there is no movement toward doing that by the Department of Labor. However, if you feel strongly about the suggestion, perhaps there are people here either serving on policy boards whose policy recommendations at one time or another could incorporate that suggestion, or perhaps you may want to take it up with DOL officials who are present. My understanding is that there is no independent initiative to do that at this point.

Q: (From the floor) Mr. Greenspan, you have been looking at the implementation of CETA over the last couple of years. Suppose a recession did finally arrive in 1980, of all the programs which would you suggest or recommend to policy makers for implementation and which would be most efficient to offset that recession.

A: (Greenspan) I think I would recommend an enlargement of the public service employment program as one of a number of efforts. The reason why I would particularly be interested in the PSE program is because I think that program would reach the disadvantaged employment worker, whereas a general tax cut would probably reemploy the more skilled worker who had recently been laid off as a result of the recession.

Q: (Bill Kulvesky) This question relates to Pedro's earlier comments with respect to the inadequacy of present evaluations and what recommendations he might make, or why he feels that SER's own evaluations might be a superior method.

A: (Garza) On the evaluation systems, one of the victims of CETA was a SER evaluation system. At one point we were a prime sponsor contracting directly from the Department of Labor. We operated our programs on a national basis. And with CETA our programs were decentralized. They became accountable and responsible to a local prime sponsor rather than to a national SER office, so we do not have a national evaluation system, per se. The problem that we see with the evaluation of the prime sponsors right now is that many different programs, and the many different objectives of the different programs, make evaluation difficult. And because it is difficult, there is not the emphasis on it that there should be.

One thing that could certainly be changed is the focus on numbers. How many did you serve? There is no emphasis on the types of

services delivered. When it comes to comparing programs, the evaluators look at how much it costs you to place someone in a job or how many people you serve for how many dollars, without looking at the disadvantaged. For instance, a monolingual needs 24 weeks of ESL in order to be able to go into an OJT for a skilled training component. So, the emphasis seems to be absolutely quantitative with no serious regard for types of services and, again, for meshing or gearing the needs of enrollees or participants to the cost. If we look at numbers, types of services, the quality of staff, I do not think there is any evaluation done by prime sponsors in terms of patterns of staffing. We have a number of prime sponsors where Hispanics are totally and grossly underrepresented on the prime sponsor's staff. Those are some of the evaluation criteria that we would suggest.

Q: (Kulvesky) So you are saying basically that evaluations now are simplistic headcounts and cost-efficiency type analyses, but that, really, what we need to do is paying more attention to those who are being served. We need to go back to those people being served and ask them what they are getting out of these services.

A: (Garza) For instance, I think the Department of Labor is on the right track when they emphasize targeting services for those most in need. I think the evaluation process right now stops at the annual plan. They do not look at the services that were targeted for those people. They target the clients, but they do not target the services. I think you need both approaches in order to do any kind of valid evaluation. It is a massive problem. Another problem, what happens after a person goes to CETA, needs to be looked into. It seems to me that over the past five years there has been way too much emphasis on public sector employment and "make work", work experience, programs and really not enough emphasis on actual training and upgrading of participants, not enough focus on the structurally unemployed.

Q: (Kulvesky) When I think of CETA, I think of it as being a firm program related to trying to improve the quality of peoples' lives. From what I am hearing here, I get the impression that some people view it as a way of taking care of the unemployed. Which is the primary objective?

A: (Garza) When a recession does arrive and you need a quick remedy, that is you need to get people back into jobs really fast, the quickest way has proven to be public service employment. But you do not do it at the expense of the structurally unemployed. You have to come up with the right mix of services, of dollars. It is not all of one and none of the other.

Q: (From the floor) I just want to comment that many of us are from CBOs, such as TELACU, which are people-oriented programs. We are discussing here people-oriented programs addressing services to the individual. On the other hand, because of the other economic and

unemployment issues as Mr. Green stated, the CETA programs are used as an alternative to employment or to address the national employment problem. We are coming from two different directions, and it seems to me that we should be able to at least address and mesh some of the problems and concerns which we have at this point in terms of the realities of CETA programs.

A: (Greenspan) I think my answer ties in with what Mr. Garza has been discussing as well. From our observation of the CETA planning system and its review, we really do not think it has been very effective in these more substantive matters, and frankly I am very skeptical that you are going to make it more effective by getting after the national office of the Department of Labor. I think really there are only a couple of ways of making CETA more effective: One is by having a national campaign on a specific issue. In the past, for example, the enrollment of veterans has been a national objective, and there were some successes in that, despite lots of difficulties. But the avenue that I see as being most effective, although I think it is an extremely difficult one, is local control. You have got to be after your local prime sponsors, and that is the answer, really.

Q: (Cisneros) How does a local community-based organization make progress in a milieu that involves political pressures, antagonisms, and bad press?

A: (Escarcega) There is no one single way that you could do this. If you can get the ear of some influential person in the area, that is another approach. There are very loose provisions in the law so that if an issue or a grievance is made known to the regional office, they will inquire as to how they relate to the plan. If they are judged to be part of the plan, then you receive consideration based on demonstrated effectiveness. Those provisions have the loose language that I am very critical of in the present law.

Q: (From the floor) One of the major problems of the CETA operation is that a city commissioner, a city councilman, or a county commissioner is making decisions on funding when they do not know anything about CETA. I have seen different universities like Pan American and the University of Houston develop training for the senior staff of prime sponsors. And I think there ought to be an effort to develop training for making decisions on how the money should be spent. There is no effort in this area at all. I do repeat that I am impressed by your (Dr. Cisneros') knowledge of CETA, and I think that the more we educate the local legislators who are making these labor policies at the local level the better off we will be in areas of problems like the ones mentioned here.

A: (Cisneros) I think that is a good point. I had the opportunity this week to be in Washington with a group that HUD had put together to work on the President's National Urban Policy. I just

mention this as a sidelight because what we were working on was reviewing the draft of the document that is going to be submitted to the White House and in turn be published in a month or so as the national urban policy report. By law the President has to make a report every two years. One of the issues that was brought up there in the discussion by elected officials, mayors and council types, but was never comprehended either by research/academic persons present or by HUD officials, was the whole problem of building "capacity" at the local level, that is the critical need to enhance the delivery system in terms of management. How do you get people who are fully competent and managerially capable in the delivery of social and human resources programs? I think this has a lot to do with the credibility of the programs and how they are viewed by elected officials and by the public. We are seeing a similar situation not only in manpower programs but also in social services all across the board. It is an appropriate and important issue for further discussion and study.

THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF
THE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

Howard Rosen*

Let me talk generally about the R&D program in the Employment and Training Administration. Fred Tello, who is the project officer on the Hispanic R&D work, will get into the details as to what we have funded and some of the things we are planning in the future.

Let me first give you a brief history of why there is an R&D program in the Employment & Training Administration. The original Manpower Development Training Act directed the Secretary of Labor to create a R&D program, and gave him the authority to grant money and to contract for what we call extramural research. That is, research, experiments, and demonstrations that could be conducted outside of the Department of Labor for a variety of social and economic problems which were identified in both the Manpower Act and in the CETA legislation which followed. Title III of the CETA legislation spells out in considerable detail many of the problems that we are directed to be concerned with. We are directed to conduct R&D work on discrimination in employment, the labor market problems of minorities, the employment and training problems of Blacks, Hispanics, Indians, welfare recipients, single family heads, displaced homemakers, ex-offenders, the handicapped, the older workers, the uneducated, and the untrained. These are just some of the complex socioeconomic problems that we are supposed to solve with research and with Experimental and Demonstration (E&D) monies.

We get about \$13 million a year to run both research and experimental and demonstration projects. Out of that \$13 million, \$900,000 is assigned to the International Labor Affairs Bureau, so that we always end up with about \$12 million. Of that \$12 million, 2.6 million goes to institutional grants, such as the one at The University of Texas at San Antonio; \$600,000 goes to support students working in their Ph.D.s; \$500,000 is earmarked for specific Hispanic research. We put aside one million each year for the employment service R&D program. We also set aside one million for the CETA R&D program, and another one million for an apprenticeship R&D program.

*Dr. Howard Rosen is former Director of the Office of Research and Development, Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor.

The fact is that we never have enough money at the end of the fiscal year to support all those projects that we want or need to fund.

Since many academicians, particularly young scholars, are in this room, I would like to talk a little bit about how we go through the funding process. We use several approaches to fund projects. In addition to a sole source, we also use what is known as a Request For Proposal or RFP. I would suggest that most scholars who come from the academic community should come into the Department of Labor's R&D program through what we call the sole source route. That is, come up with an idea, outline your proposal, and then send two or three pages explaining what you want to do and how you will do it, and ask us to react to it. This is a much simpler way for academics to reach us rather than through the complex Request for Proposal route. The Requests for Proposal are primarily directed toward the research companies and management companies that can respond to requests for proposals for large-scale projects. It is unlikely that an academic person is an expert in writing up proposals in response to all of these RFPs. We once did a study of the RFP industry, and within a six-block area in Washington D.C., on Connecticut Avenue, there were 33 companies whose full-time activity was that of writing grants and submitting proposals to the federal government. It is unlikely that a lone college professor writing by himself could react fast usually within 30 days, nor could he or she be as good a creative writer as the grantsmen who are employed by these companies. My suggestion is that you approach us through the sole source route or through Fred Tello's special RFP arrangement for Hispanic research.

We have had a Ph.D. program since 1965. About 500 people have written their doctoral dissertation under our sponsorship. The young scholars can apply for their Ph.D.s when they are about to complete all of their requirements (comprehensive exams, language requirements, etc.), and when they know that they need money to sit down and write a doctoral dissertation and to be able to concentrate on it for at least one year without doing any outside work. The Ph.D. program has really been one of the very effective ways of creating a cadre, in the United States, of experts and researchers who can help us. It is interesting to note that five of the Hispanic scholars attending this particular conference all received their Ph.D.s under our sponsorship: Arthur Padilla, Richard Santos, Gilbert Cardenas, Raul Moncarz, and Ronald Oaxaca. We conduct surveys to learn where our scholars work and whether they are employed, because we are very concerned about producing an even supply. We are not interested in creating Ph.D.s who can not find jobs. The last study we did indicated that about 99% were working. One woman was out of the labor force, and we think she was out of the labor force having a baby. In all, the Ph.D.s have done very well in the labor market.

We know, for example, that they are working in the Congressional Budget Office, they are working in the AFL/CIO, they have worked for

the Council of Economic Advisors, they have worked at HEW, the Department of Labor, and particularly on Capitol Hill. If you look at Who's Who among young scholars in the field of economics, most of those people are the products of the R&D program. This program is a deliberate investment by the Department of Labor to develop a specialized group of experts. It is our way of saying that we think these people who are given the assignment of trying to solve some of the country's more complex socioeconomic problems can make an extremely important contribution to us. In all probability, by the time some of you young scholars get ready to apply for a dissertation grant, the program will be operated by the Social Science Research Council rather than the Department of Labor. It is our intention to keep this program going. The money will be there, and we will continue on with the same approach.

When you apply for a Ph.D., you apply through your school. We use a panel of five outsiders who are non-Department of Labor people and who review the proposals and make the decision as to who should be funded and who should not be funded.

We have discontinued what used to be known as the small grant program for postdoctoral research. However, people who want to submit this type of proposal can come in through the regular program rather than through the small grant program.

Now, let me turn next to the institutional grant program. Some sixteen schools get money on a four-year basis from us. We ask them to be concerned with the training of professional scholars as well as professional administrators and program operators who now run, or will operate, the employment and training programs of the United States. We have one regular school in one of the ten regions; we have four schools with a predominantly Black student body; we have one school that concentrates on the American Indians; and one school that serves Hispanics. Pan American University in Edinburg was the school that previously had the Hispanic program. Today it is The University of Texas at San Antonio which has the institutional grant for this four year term.

Now, let us turn to the research program. The largest single expenditure that we have ever invested in research has been for the National Longitudinal Survey. This is the survey that has been conducted since 1966. The data are collected for us by the Census Bureau. The analysis of the data is done for us by Ohio State University. We have been following up some 20,000 people in the labor market. It is a unique set of data which we make available at the modest price of \$300. This is far less than the actual cost, because we want to encourage scholars to use those data tapes and to learn about the labor market operation and experience of some 20,000 cohorts.

As Dr. Santos pointed out yesterday, we have a new National Longitudinal Survey that has just been started. We are collecting data from some 13,000 young people who are going to be followed up for a period of five years. I urge all researchers who are not afraid of handling large data bases, and who want to get access to an unusual set of data, to start getting in touch with Ohio State University and Dr. Santos about these tapes. In this new data tape out of 13,000 young men and young women, ages 14 to 21, some 1,872 are Hispanic youths. I repeat this is a very important new data base. We urge scholars to look into these data because of their enormous implications for information about young persons in our society.

Let me now turn to our regular research program. I can only touch upon some highlights. One of our early success stories took place when we asked Dr. Ray Marshall to study the reasons why Blacks could not get into the apprenticeship system in the United States. That one study has probably had one of the most important impacts on the labor market and training opportunities, enabling minority workers to get into the apprenticeship system. We have just published a compendium which includes some 16 years of R&D work. You will note, by looking at the compendium, that we have made heavy investments on questions of discrimination in the labor force, on questions of women in the labor force, on welfare recipients, on undocumented workers, on apprentices, on Blacks, and on Hispanics. Take a look at the compendium; I urge you to order copies so that you can understand what we have been trying to do in the last 16 years. We have made heavy investments on CETA programs, on the employment problems of people coming out of prison, on the dual labor market, on the internal labor market, on farm workers, on fertility, and on geographical mobility. If you are looking for areas of research, the compendium is a very important document which may stimulate your thinking.

In addition to the regular research program, we have made very considerable investments in what we call experimental or demonstration projects. Most academic people do not work under our experimental and demonstration projects. What we have done in the E&D program is to use the methods and techniques of the physical sciences in trying to actually create new institutions or create carefully designed research models which will tell us what happens as a result of giving people different kinds of treatment.

One of the largest experiments that has ever been conducted in the field of correction took place in the State of Texas and in the State of Georgia. We tested whether income assistance could reduce the prison return rate of people coming out of prison in both of these states.

We had tested this concept earlier in the State of Maryland. We received results which indicated that apparently there may be a very significant difference if people did get some income in the difficult

adjustment period when they were leaving prison and entering civilian life.

Most people do not know that our state prisons release a hundred thousand people every year into the labor market. Most of us do not know that 50% of those people in state prisons are Blacks and Hispanics. Twenty percent of the population in Texas is Hispanic, but 50% of the people in the state prisons of Texas are Hispanics.

These E&D projects are very important kinds of activities in which we always try to attach a research component. Although most academic people have had very little contact with experiments, I should recommend that more of them should get interested in these operational projects that we conduct. They can make a contribution by helping us design these experiments and studying the research results of people participating in these experiments or demonstrations.

In April (1980) you will be hearing about a major project that has been conducted by a group of federal agencies. The Department of Labor, as well as the Ford Foundation, took the lead in conducting a project called Supported Work, in which we took people who were ex-offenders, juvenile delinquents, welfare mothers, and drug addicts, and put them into a special work situation to see whether or not we could have an impact on their future employment and earnings. This is a project which had a good research design built into its operational structure and has withstood rigorous examination. We feel that our findings have been able to have a real impact on the employability of welfare mothers. We believe that an E&D project such as Supported Work with its careful research design can provide data to policy makers who can make decisions about expanding social programs.

Let me talk a little bit about the use of R&D programs. I want to note that there are two worlds: there is the world of the academic researcher, and then there is the world of the government administrator of an R&D program. You get your rewards in the academic world if you write an article that is published or a book that is based on your research. Nobody asks you what impact did this have on unemployment or on employment opportunities or on discrimination. You contribute information, and that is a very good activity, and I am heartily in favor of it. But I get asked a different question. We are often asked, "How many unemployed workers have received jobs because of the programs you are running?", "What have you done about discrimination?", "What did you do for the women in our labor force?" So, we have to be concerned about the use and applications of R&D programs, not just whether or not somebody had it published in the journal or that we have another book to put in our bookcase. Our research program must be able to help the operator of a program in East Los Angeles or San Antonio or in Chicago or Detroit. That is what they are concerned about, not necessarily just information--but information that is useful. So there is a difference in the two worlds as to what happens to the R&D studies that we support.

Actually, our R&D program has probably had its greatest impact on legislation. If you look at the new CETA legislation, we can identify 13 separate items in that legislation that came out of R&D work. For example, there is a whole section on job search and relocation, there is a new definition of ex-offenders. We can go on referring to parts of that legislation which originated with the R&D program. However, the important point that I want to make to researchers attending this conference is that when we receive proposals, one of the questions we ask ourselves is how can we use the results of the research findings? And we ask researchers that same question. There is a difference in the approach of a mission-oriented, government operated R&D program, as compared with the interests of the academic community.

One of the best examples of use and application of a demonstration program is one which has been taking minority women who have both professional and technical training, who are either unemployed or underemployed, and who are being placed in jobs commensurate with their education and training. This project, known as the Minority Women Employment Project, has placed about 2,000 women. Ten percent of those women were Hispanics who were placed into professional and technical jobs.

When the research was completed, the question was raised, how do you institutionalize this type of project? We persuaded Dr. Glover who did the research, to prepare a manuscript which was eventually printed as a paperback book called Stepping Up. Then we prepared a letter for the Secretary of Labor for his signature and sent it with the paperback to the 800 largest corporations in the United States. It is our hope that when the executives of these companies read that book, they will make use of the Minority Women Employment Project to recruit for their professional and technical staffs.

What about our future research plans? We will continue to be concerned about the problem of how to get welfare recipients into work. We are, of course, interested in the problems of inflation and unemployment; we want to know more about problems of the undocumented aliens and how they are doing in our labor force. We have a growing interest in women who are heading families, the so called, single-headed families, because the number of women who are heading families rose from 5 million to 8½ million in 10 years. That is one of the fastest demographic changes occurring in our society. We need to know what kinds of jobs do these women have? Are they able to support their families? We have a continued interest in minority youth, whether Blacks or Hispanics. We need more information about the employment problems of ex-offenders. To summarize, we are interested in those members of our society who are having a difficult time in finding jobs which enable them to live above the poverty level.

Let me conclude by offering some free advice to new researchers. As an administrator of an R&D program, I have been bothered by the

fact that many young researchers follow newspaper headlines too frequently. That is, when a news item hits the newspapers, they think that these news items represent important social and economic problems. The fact is that many newspaper stories reflect the fertile imagination of newspaper journalists who are not capable social scientists or careful analysts of social problems. So one piece of advice that I should like to give is: I have always noted that if you are doing good research, the newspaper headlines will find you. Don't you follow the newspaper headlines. Try to select research subjects which are significant and can be justified with some hard facts. Second, try to become a specialist in one research area before you jump to your next subject of study.

The next piece of advice is much more difficult to follow. We always seek out innovative and creative people. How do you tell researchers how to be innovative and creative? We receive too many proposals that seem to be primarily concerned with attacking somebody else's theory or massaging old census data. The 1980 census is coming up, and there should be some good research that can be done with the data. Do not make a career out of reworking old census data forever. Do not get hung up only on secondary data. Do not be afraid to go into new fields, and do not even be afraid to cross disciplines. It is possible to learn the jargon of different social sciences. Be adventuresome; move into other fields. You may be able to bring a fresh view about social problems when you cut across disciplines. The clients we deal with in the employment and training field do not fit neatly into social science disciplines. They are human beings who may face economic or psychological problems, and they may be dealing with institutions or societal arrangements which will not let them have access to decent jobs. No single discipline can help us solve all the complex social and economic issues found in our society.

The next piece of advice is, be objective. Even if the truth turns out to be different from what you expected, be honest and publish it. To this particular audience, let me make another observation. Please do not operate under the theory that because many of you are Hispanics that you should only do research on Hispanics. Think of yourself as a social scientist, and if you can contribute any help to the problems of Hispanics, that is fine. But your training should enable you to see beyond just one ethnic group. Your talents and training can be applied to many problems. Do not feel inhibited and restricted to the people for whom you feel a special affinity. We need your expertise on many problems not just a single area of concern.

The next piece of advice is, after you get your Ph.D., do not be afraid to get your hands dirty by doing primary research. It is easier to sit in an office and look at secondary data for your entire research career. I want to suggest that there is limit as to what you can learn from those secondary data. You can become a humanitarian as well as a true social scientist if you go into East Los Angeles and

look into the problems faced by an organization operating a program there. Use your professional training to help the operators of this program, because you have something that very few people in the country have, and that is technical training capable of improving our society. So get your hands dirty, go out there and learn what is going on in the world and do not be afraid to work with people who operate and administer programs. They need your help, and if they are intelligent, they will accept your help. Do not let that Ph.D. separate you from the real problems of the world.

The next piece of advice is, and this is something that Dr. Sar Levitan was giving you yesterday, do not let what you learned in school prevent you from doing good research. In other words, some of the things you learned in school, I can guarantee you now, are not going to be too helpful to you as a researcher. Be critical, and even be cynical about what you learned and what can apply to a social problem. This applies to economic theory as well as man-in-the-street wisdom. The minute anything becomes conventional wisdom, I become concerned about it. When some one tells me, "This is the way the world is today, and there is no way of changing it," then I know this is a situation that requires change. We ought to have a course in cynicism in our colleges and universities; a course in questioning. Question what the teacher taught you or what he is teaching you--do not be afraid. If he is a good teacher, he should respect you for questioning conventional wisdom.

My next advice calls for the translating of jargon into English. There is a paperback on display at this conference called A Popularized Version of 21 Doctoral Dissertations. We had this book published because we received many Ph.D. theses which could not be understood by non-experts. I am convinced that much of our professional jargon is an excuse for thinking. If you cannot communicate with program operators and administrators, and tell them what you have learned as a result of your research, you may have failed as a researcher. If your sole purpose in life is to write an article which only you and a couple of hundred specialists can read, that is great, but do not kid yourself about your great contribution to the social and economic problems of the world.

The next piece of advice is, do not be afraid to make suggestions as long as you base them on research findings. The people who operate and administer programs in the U.S., whether they are in HEW or in the Department of Labor, need help and advice. They need good help and advice. They make decisions most of the time with limited information and with the additional handicap of their own biases and prejudices. Do not be afraid to offer suggestions. You do have to understand, however, that even though you might have made a contribution to the fund of information, when a policy decision is made there will be factors taken into that decision other than just your research findings. Policy decisions are not made solely on the basis of research findings. They are part of a complex web of political interrelationships that must be taken into consideration by policy makers.

I hope that you will take the advice I have given you with the understanding that it is based on some 18 years experience of an R&D administrator who has conscientiously tried to make the greatest use of social science and social scientists in solving the complex problems faced by our society.

HISPANICS IN THE 1980s: A WORK FORCE ON THE MOVE

Esteban E. Torres*

It is not only an honor but also a pleasure for me to be with you this evening. As social scientists you have an intimate understanding of the importance of human resource development, and as Hispanics you are well aware of the changes that must be effected to better and more fully maximize our Hispanic human resources. While it is incumbent upon us as individuals to encourage and promote the development of Hispanic human resources, it is also essential that our individual efforts be coupled with a strong and effective public policy initiative. And it is to this end that the CETA human resource development policy and programs for Hispanics must direct its efforts.

While this symposium will familiarize you with the CETA administration and research and development, I would like to share a few of the ideas and concerns of the Carter Administration with respect to Hispanics in the labor market. The President is well aware of the urgent need to employ gainfully the Hispanic population. With our population approaching a 16 million figure, our impact as a group will be felt not only within the labor market but also in all related areas.

To conquer the problems of underdevelopment, underutilization, and underrepresentation of Hispanics in the labor market, we must first determine that the employment and training facilities, programs and personnel are responsive to the urgent needs of our community. Our governmental officials bear the responsibility for insuring that the programs developed to assist the Hispanic community in strengthening its socioeconomic profile in this country effectively fulfill that function.

The role of employment and training programs (CETA) is an historic innovation in economic policy. The Carter Administration envisions a two fold role for employment and training programs, the first of which is to strengthen the American economy overall and the second of which is to secure a more equitable distribution of its benefits.

To better grasp the impact of the Hispanic community on the work force, the significance of the census must be emphasized. With an accurate count of our numbers, we can more fully comprehend the scope

*Ambassador Esteban Torres is Special Assistant to the President for Hispanic Affairs.

and extent of the problems confronting Hispanics in the labor market. Statistics gathered from the 1980 census can help us to pinpoint our problem areas while providing a useful arsenal to back up our requests for federal funding of labor and employment related programs.

As we seek to increase our participation in the work force, we must simultaneously explore new avenues of employment. We must travel beyond the traditional confines of our labor participation and understand that as individuals we may pursue the careers and occupations of our choice. However, beyond that, we must be supportive of other Hispanics and encourage them to be equally as adventurous.

Our participation in the labor market can be enhanced by an improvement in the quality of education that our people receive. Thought and energies must be directed to the quality of education currently available to Hispanics whose first language is Spanish. Bilingual education, school finance reform, and the education of alien children are other issues that must be appropriately resolved in this decade to serve the best interest of our community. While trying to reduce the number of Hispanic dropouts in high schools, we must also see to it that Hispanics are not graduating from the 12th grade with a less than 5th grade reading ability. Poorly educated children replenish the all too familiar cycle of low-skilled, low-wage employment. We must encourage our Hispanic youth to pursue higher education so that within our communities we have the resources available to fill the many professional, technical, and managerial positions that will be ours for the taking in the 1980s.

Post-secondary vocational and technical training is also an important element in the drive to improve the occupational distribution and income level of Hispanics. Many new jobs are being created in areas of high technology, and we must be properly trained in order to fill these positions.

To accomplish these lofty yet attainable goals, we must have a game plan based on realities and available resources. No one is better than Hispanic scholars trained and schooled in the social sciences to contribute to this effort. Perhaps this is the significance of this symposium.

Our efforts must be directed to those within the educational systems and for those outside that system--for their problems within the labor market are the problems of all Hispanics. It is important for us to realize the CETA and related employment and training legislation play a significant role in addressing the problems of the Hispanic work force.

The federal government must provide a wide range of services and programs which are flexible rather than static. These can range from job information services for individuals temporarily out of work to public service employment for those unable to find jobs in a distressed economy. At every level of employment and training services

Hispanics should not only be recipients but also providers. At every level Hispanics should not only be receivers of information but also producers; Hispanics should not only be users, but also designers of the delivery system.

We should not only be subjects, but also evaluators of the successes and failures of our employment and training programs. At every level Hispanics should be not only the contractors but also the contracting officers. At every level of decision making and policy making Hispanics should not only be subjects of labor market theories but also authors of these theories.

We must be not only employees but also employers; not only trainees but also trainers; not only be supervised, but also super-visors; not only managed, but also managers.

We must alter our self-perceptions and regard ourselves as a valuable resource essential to the smooth functioning of our country. No longer are we this country's problem child to be pacified and shelved until the next outburst or incident of misconduct. We are a minority group to be reckoned with, and we must project a new image to the nation at large and within our own communities. This symposium can be a seminal force in altering our image. Your studies, research, and evaluations can help define the issues, describe the problems, and propose the policies. Your talent, skills, insights, and perceptions are essential to our progress.

Our future is bright, and I am greatly encouraged by the fact that a symposium such as this can take place.

I am especially pleased that a group of young scholars and professors are the participants in the symposium. It is gratifying to see that your talent and skill is not only recognized, but also utilized. I know that many of you who are now students will soon be filling policy and management positions on boards, on commissions, and in the executive agencies.

By sponsoring the symposium, The University of Texas at San Antonio is fulfilling the role for which it is ideally suited. As an institution of high learning serving a predominantly Hispanic population in San Antonio and Texas, it can be a window to the nation for all to see Hispanics as a rich and valuable resource.

I enter the 1980s with renewed energies, and I can only challenge you to not let the exchange of ideas and the plans for the future end up as the rhetoric of just another symposium. What you plan today must be followed through tomorrow. Not only are we the "music makers and dreamers of dreams, more importantly, it is we who are the movers and shakers." This is our decade and we must make it one to remember.

DATA SOURCES

WHAT'S IN A NUMBER?

Sar A. Levitan*

The imposing title, "Socioeconomic Data as a Policy Tool," for this after-lunch talk that appears in your program is not of my choosing. If I had to pick a title for these remarks, it would be: "What's In a Number?" My answer would be "plenty," and the rest of this homily would be a comment on that reply. As a text for this afternoon, I will paraphrase Shakespeare: He who steals my number steals my purse. The Bard used no footnotes, so I will improve upon his work by adding: When he steals my purse, that he -ts.

Let us start with the assumption that knowledge is power. Some of you in the audience probably are ready to contradict this simple maxim. Isn't it true that once one knows the ways of Washington, one sees time and again that it is politics that controls decisions? The real evaluation job is to see what pays off the most in the voting booth, and this is particularly true if the year happens to be divisible by four.

There is no question that this happens. The first golden rule of politics is to get elected, and the second is to stay elected. Since we are talking about CETA today, we all know that when a CETA amendment is presented to Congress, a bunch of brainy boys and girls from the Labor Department are sure to be on Capitol Hill. And they will be presenting offerings in the form of computer printouts showing that the administration's proposal is the best thing for this member's district--or for a particular Senator's state--since Noah was saved from the flood. However, in the long run it is information that creates policy. I know Keynes noted that "in the long run we are all dead." Fortunately, the long run I am talking about does not require that many years.

Policy and Data

On the way here I was traveling with the Godfather of this conclave, the learned Dr. Rosen, and I asked him how would he illustrate that knowledge is power. Rosen told me that I should just remind you about the background to CETA. History shows that the early manpower programs--and I am not being a male chauvinist since that is what we used to call them in those good old days--were a response to the fear

*Dr. Sar A. Levitan is Director of the Center for Social Policy Studies, George Washington University.

of automation. The scare word in the early 1960s was automation. We were told that it was killing 50,000 jobs a week and, therefore, we had to do something about automation.

We started with Manpower Development and Training Act to retrain and retread those people who became obsolete because of automation. Research sponsored by MDTA and others showed that this automation scenario was not strictly true. In most cases, the people who were automated out of their jobs got other jobs. However, we discovered that we had in our society some people who fell by the wayside. For numerous reasons, they never joined the mainstream, either because they failed or because they were failed by society. Slowly employment and training programs were turned around because of this knowledge produced by the growing number of human resource analysts. This information indicated that the real problem dealt with structural unemployment which often had not that much to do with automation.

Numbers do create policy. Let us turn to some of the major Great Society social programs. In the 1960s there was a rise in consciousness that we had to reduce poverty. Going back to 1964, when this war on poverty was started, we had hardly any statistics. How many people were poor in the United States? What were their characteristics? No one really knew; there were all sorts of guesses. Michael Harrington wrote a book, and he picked the number 50 million. It was a nice round number and sounded good. It showed much compassion and imagination, but he had no real knowledge or information to support his numbers. Yet it helped a great deal to raise the public consciousness. You cannot shape programs without the necessary data.

In 1964 an analyst in HEW, Molly Orshansky, hammered out some numbers that measured poverty in the United States. I remember a discussion at that time when she estimated the poverty threshold was \$3,000 per year for a family of four. Now it is \$6,700. Some said it was too high, and some said it was too little. But most people said "Who cares?" Let the statisticians in Census worry about it. The professors can write all the articles they want disputing the estimates one way or another. But slowly these numbers assumed a power of their own, and they became the justification for the social programs of the 1960s and 1970s. According to these figures, there were 40 million poor people in the 1960s. By the end of the decade we had somewhere around 24 million destitute individuals. The figures supplied powerful ammunition to those who defended the antipoverty programs. Again, the numbers themselves assumed a power of their own; they create a push for policy and programs. And to carry this tale up to date to see how this develops and evolves, look at President Carter's proposals on welfare reform. They include a plan that would guarantee every family with children at least 65 percent of the poverty threshold whether or not family members work.

If welfare reform ever materializes and, if the poverty threshold had been set not at \$6,700, but, say at \$8,000, many people would be

getting \$5,200 instead of \$4,355. To those millions of people who are poor, this would make a very real difference. Indeed, right now the poverty threshold income or a multiple thereof determines whether a child gets a subsidized or free lunch in school.

Numbers and statistics alone do not solve problems. However, they can point to problems we never even knew existed or forgot about, and this creates the need for new initiatives. Let me give one example. It is easy when you live in an urban center to forget about the problems of the rural poor. Prior to becoming Secretary of Labor, Ray Marshall conducted numerous studies which would not let us forget about this sector of society. The estimates produced by Marshall and others showed us that these areas of rural destitution required special remedial efforts.

Accuracy and Data

Let us turn to an issue which is of immediate interest to this audience, the 1980 Census. Again, some would say, Who cares how many Hispanics there are in the United States? Is it 8 million or 12 million? Sure, it is nice to know, but what is the difference? Some of us do care--and not only professors. For example, the lady who appeared this morning, The Honorable Lila Cockrell, is affected by this. If many Hispanics are not counted, that would mean that San Antonio would get less money from Uncle Sam. Therefore, again, the numbers are actually shaping policy and determine the allocation of billions of dollars.

The Bureau of Census, as we were told this morning, is making a serious effort to try to cut the under counting. But if the Bureau of Census misses several million Hispanics, this means that the Current Population Survey will not be a true random sample. That would be reflected in national, state, and local unemployment rates. CETA formulas are tied to these numbers, and even an error of less than one percentage point involves millions of dollars. If you think that is an exaggeration, look at middle-sized cities. Think what happens when several thousand unemployed people are not counted; that may mean the loss of millions of dollars to that city. Then you realize how important these numbers are. That is why it is so important that we do have an accurate count in the 1980 census.

We should carry the message to our communities that when a household gives data to the Census, it has never, to the best of my knowledge, become public. We have been reading in recent years about another government agency that gave out data quite freely to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. But there was never any such scandal that the Census had disclosed data. It is very important in 1980 that we get a full count of Hispanics and other minorities because of the way the federal government is distributing money. Not only CETA, but all sorts of other programs are based on these data. Back in 1960 this would not have been as important since state and local estimates were

not used that much as an allocation tool. But we have become much more dependent on these numbers, and they now directly affect numerous policies. That is why he who steals my number can hurt me if I am governor, mayor, county executive, or just a private citizen.

Another point I would like to lobby for deals with a related issue. Recently the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics called for the expansion of the Current Population Survey (CPS) sample, upon which employment and unemployment statistics are based. Currently the CPS depends on the responses of the 70,000 households. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics argued that a sample of 70,000 is not large enough. It does not give us enough accuracy on the numbers covering minority groups. The commission recommended that the sample be increased to 110,000. That would give us better local data as well as improved minority data. In addition, the commission recommended that 10,000 additional minority people be surveyed. Right now when the BLS announces monthly that, for example, Black or Spanish youth unemployment rose from 30 to 33 percent, the BLS will say this was not significant. But when unemployment increased for the rest of the population by .2 percent, they will say that was significant. BLS has been accused by some that its officials do not care about minorities and that is why they say it is not significant. The point is that the sample on minority youth is not large enough to indicate that a monthly change is statistically significant. The costs to make this change are rather small. I hate to be talking about \$20 million as being little money, but considering that billions of dollars are riding on those numbers, I think that the data which determine the allocation of the funds would be of interest to you.

Economic Hardship

Another area that is of particular interest to this group is that right now BLS places emphasis on counting bodies: So many people are employed, or unemployed, or not in the labor force. They do report the age, sex and a few other interesting items, but tend to gloss over the fact that most people work for an income. BLS does not report how people are making out in the labor market. By making out I do not mean what you youngsters sometimes think. What I mean is: Do they make a basic living or they exist in destitution? How many people are working full time and are still living in poverty? Some people may be unemployed and living on \$50,000 a year. In other words, for purposes of social and economic policy we need to know much more than just how many people are working or how many individuals are unemployed. We need some measure of economic hardship which combines labor force information with income data. A family can still be in poverty even though members of the household are in the ranks of the American workforce.

The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics recommended that in addition to counting the labor force, BLS should

link employment with income. BLS is now in the process of preparing an annual report on the basis of the Commission's recommendation. Again, this is something that you in the Hispanic community, who are doing research in this field, ought to take a closer look at. How much money will come to your community will very frequently depend only on labor force data. If we distribute more money on the basis of income, and not just on the basis of employment or unemployment status, then areas with many minority group residents would tend to get more money from the federal government. Now is the time to develop your position on how to link employment with income data. While BLS has been very slow in advancing that link, I think they are now on the right track. However, it helps to do a little pushing. I hope that you will put measuring labor market connected hardship on your research agenda because I would guarantee you that millions of dollars would be coming to cities like San Antonio and others, if BLS would publish the figures on real economic hardship. If BLS would link employment and income, and then distribute the money on that basis, then the wealthy suburban youngster who may want a couple hours of work but can not find it would not be seen to pose as serious a social problem compared with the household head who earns the minimum wage--or less--but still can not pull his or her family out of poverty.

By using real measures of economic hardship and linking employment with income, the unemployment head of a family whose income is below the poverty line would not be counted the same as the unemployment youngster who lives in a family that still has a household income above the median. I think if I would single out any of the commissions recommendations to those of you who are interested in distributing CETA money more equitably on the basis of need, then this would be the most important proposal in the entire report.

Changes are Necessary

Before we become too much enamored with numbers, let me suggest a caveat. There is always a danger that once we have a set of numbers, they are hard to change. Any time there are so many billions of dollars riding on those numbers, then some people representing certain interests are going to oppose change. The Consumer Price Index is a good example. Never mind if the old CPI was good measure of inflation, many workers had cost of living increases tied to these numbers.

The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics considered carefully the advisability of changing counting 16 year old youngsters in the labor force. Some said we should not count the youngster as unemployed if he or she is only looking for a couple hours of work. Some other nations do not. But immediately this idea caused problems. Some people who have wanted to stress the unemployment problem argued that this should not be done. Others just opposed any break in the continuity of the numbers. As a result, we found that it was very difficult to make any changes. One of the things we should realize before we start a new series of numbers is that the

data assume a power of their own. They influence policy and very frequently, if they hang on too long, they make poor policy.

Some have charged that I never saw a number I did not like. This charge is not true. On the wall in my office, there is a sign which reads: Statistics are no substitute for judgment. I hope our policy makers are not going to design policies without statistics and good judgment because I would rather make policies on whatever information we have than without data. I would not want to trust the gut feeling of many of our members of Congress or Senators, because without the numbers, I am afraid they will direct the policies to help the sectors of society that least need assistance.

Questions and Answers

Q: (From the floor) Some states do not collect statistics on minorities. What is your feeling on this?

A: My earlier comments related to federal statistics, mostly the Current Population Survey. If you want a state to collect data on minorities, political pressure might be exercised to do so; it is like buying any other good or service. However, for the purposes of distributing federal funds, I would not use state estimates; only federal statistics will do since we could not rely upon each state to collect independent statistics. The conflict of interest is obvious if the funds allocated to each state would depend upon the labor force statistics supplied by the states. The Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics are technically best equipped to supply uniform information to Congress and other policy makers. States may, however, desire to supplement the federal statistics for purposes of serving state policy makers, business communities, and others who are interested in labor force statistics for operational purposes.

Q: (From the floor) Did the commission recommendation of raising the CPS sample to 120,000 receive adequate attention? And, what would be the impact on Hispanics if the recommendation is implemented?

A: In answer to the first question, if you have read the newspapers recently, we have been worrying about Iran, Afghanistan, and inflation, to mention just a few subjects about which there is plenty to worry. The Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has not yet made, or to the best of my knowledge, headlines in San Antonio or elsewhere. This does not mean that the recommendation of the commission may not assume increasing importance when unemployment rises, then we will start paying more attention to labor force statistics. Anyway, little can be done until 1982, when the results of the 1980 census will become available, before the Current Population Survey sample can be raised to 120,000, including a 10,000 oversampling of minorities. This means that Congressional appropriations will not be forthcoming until fiscal 1982 and 1983. My hope is that

you will support the commission's recommendations and urge your favorite member of Congress to vote for the additional funds needed to raise the sample.

As far as the impact of the commission's recommendations on Hispanics is concerned, we ought to keep in mind that even the expansion of the Current Population Survey may not be adequate to supply the data that various Hispanic groups have been urging. As you well know, the 1980 Census will collect separate data for Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans, not to mention South Americans. But it would be impractical to collect added details through the CPS even when the sample should be expanded. For this type of detail, we ought to turn to ad hoc surveys.

Q: (From the floor) Why doesn't BLS publish data on Hispanics?

A: Implied in your question is a criticism of BLS and the Bureau of the Census. As I already suggested, separate data for each Hispanic group, as well as for each state or city or demographic detail would be entirely too costly and would require bothering too many households each month or each quarter depending upon the frequency of the data collection. The Hispanic community should decide what data are needed and then, instead of criticizing the Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Census or the Bureau of Labor Statistics, you should turn to Congress to request additional funds. But I would urge moderation, not only because collection of data costs money, but I also would not want to burden the population with too many government enumerators asking lots of questions. And, as you well know, it is no easier to collect data from the Hispanic community than from other groups in the population. Of course, we will get lots of detailed statistics from the decennial census. But after that, I believe that the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has gone as far as is reasonable to collect monthly labor force and related data. And, as I said earlier, I trust that you will support those modest recommendations before we make any effort to collect monthly detailed data. Blaming Census or BLS is sheer demagoguery--it is always fair game to blame the bureaucrats. If you want additional data, then you have to impress Congress to appropriate enough money to collect the data you want. But I repeat, we ought to be careful in deciding what data are actually needed and how much data would be useful for policy purposes.

Q: (From the floor) To whom do we write and how do we go about getting the needed data?

A: Before we write letters to demand additional data, as I suggested we have to decide what data can be reasonably requested and what purposes they would serve. Once we have decided upon the scope of the needed data, the normal political process is best; namely, get to your favorite members of Congress and other political figures to impress upon them the importance of the additional data for policy formulation

And you have plenty of time to do so because we are going to get a lot of detailed information from the census. The issue is what kind of data can be collected by the Bureau of the Census and analyzed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics between the decennial censuses. As I alluded to before, there is already a law that requires a mid decade census and before that, I trust that Census and BLS will expand the Current Population Survey to 120,000 households. The expansion of this survey, as I mentioned, would cost in current 1979 dollars some \$20 million a year. I trust that during the next two years, Hispanic groups will decide what priority they want to place upon the additional statistics and then inform policy makers in the administration and Congress about the need for the additional appropriations. If Hispanics and other groups place adequate priority on the expansion of the Current Population Survey, as well as the collection of data in the mid decade census, I believe that we can get all the data we can reasonably get during the 1980s. Meanwhile, this group is as well suited as anyone in determining what data should be collected.

Q: (From the floor) Isn't it true that research related to the study of Hispanic conditions carries low status in academia? What is your observation?

A: I detect some impatience on your part, and I am very sympathetic to it. My standard advice is to get a subject that is acceptable to your professor and to the Ph.D. committee in your department and then get the credentials as soon as possible. You will be fighting an uphill battle to have your views accepted and the academic credentials should help. And one nice thing about a Ph.D. is that it is forever. No one has ever suggested to defrock the Ph.D. or to debar the Ph.D.

So, to repeat, my advice is try to get the Ph.D. as soon as possible. There is no use in fighting the establishment in your department. And once you get the Ph.D., you can start doing useful work. Of course, useful work can be done without the Ph.D. but anyone who is as close as you apparently are to the degree, my advice is that you get it as soon as possible, even if the departmental committee insists upon a silly and useless subject.

I might also mention that Dr. Howard Rosen, who is here with us, established a number of years ago a dissertation award program for persons doing their dissertations on subjects broadly related to employment and training. This award covers costs of computer time, secretarial support, as well as a modest stipend to keep body and soul together while you are preparing the dissertation. And once you write some 150 pages with enough footnotes, throw in a few formulas, and build a few models, whether they have any relation to reality or not, it really does not matter, but it will usually give you a Ph.D. And once you have these credentials, they will pay off not only in the coins of the realm, inflated as they may be these days, but also in the acceptability of the policy recommendations you may want to make.

Q: (From the floor) But wouldn't that be a waste of time?

A: I agree with you. And as I have already suggested, Ph.D. credentials are not guarantee that you will be listened to or that you will improve your work. But in the long run, I believe that getting the credentials and whatever intellectual baggage you pick up doing so will pay off.

Q: (From the floor) What advice would you offer the administration in Washington?

A: The question is a bit too broad, but I hate to admit that neither Tip O'Neill nor Senator Byrd has asked for my advice. And Jimmy Carter has not done so lately, either. There are lots of things I would like to tell them, but I am sorry I have to run. And in this case, I am sure that you will believe me that I do so reluctantly because I have a dental appointment at 8:00 a.m.; so you know that I would rather stay with you than go back home. Believe me, I am leaving you painfully.

HISPANIC AMERICANS IN THE 1980 CENSUS

Leobardo Estrada*

Unprecedented attention has been drawn to the planning and development of the 1980 Census. For its part the Census Bureau has sought suggestions, comments, and constructive criticism. The awareness of the impact of the census figures can have on program funding has grown considerably as everyone here is well aware. And the days when the Census Bureau could go about its task in relative obscurity have ended.

To arrive at an understanding of the 1980 Census is not a simple matter. Some of the issues are technical in nature, for example, the allocation procedures, the weighting of the sample results, and methods to determine the undercount. Other issues are methodological in nature, for example, the callback procedures and the vacancy checks. Yet other issues are procedural in nature, for example, the coding rules and other kinds of edits. And finally, a few other issues are simply the logistical ones which have to do with the processing of 86 million forms and the employment of over 275,000 temporary employees. While a full understanding requires some basic knowledge about all of these issues, I would like to focus this presentation on the following: the census content related to minority status, an overview of the census procedure, and the relevance of using federal statistics in labor force research.

Content Related to Minority Status

The 1980 census content was determined on the basis of criteria used by the Census Bureau to determine if the information needed was of national interest. National interest has been defined as legislative needs that require particular information. Another criteria is geographic detail. Many kinds of information that we need can be gathered by a sample survey and generalized to the general population. In this particular case, items in the census are those which are required at the census tract level, at the block level, and at various small geographic levels which are not possible utilizing a survey technique. A third criteria was that of maintaining the respondent burden (the amount of time required to fill out the questionnaire) as equivalent as possible to the 1970 census.

The testing and analysis of the content and procedures began with a pretest program in Travis County, Texas; Camden, New Jersey; and

*Dr. Leobardo Estrada is Assistant to the Deputy Director, United States Bureau of the Census.

Oakland, California. In each of these areas the Bureau attempted to do a complete census of a small area to work out some of the kinks in the mechanisms and in the procedures in an effort to learn more about response to various questions. The Census Bureau then followed up with dress rehearsals in La Plata and in Montezuma Counties, Colorado; in Richmond, Virginia; and in Lower Manhattan, New York. These three came closer to emulating the final census effort and were intended as a fine tuning for our procedures.

In addition to this, I might add, the Census Bureau also undertook several special surveys, the largest of which was called the National Content Test whose purpose was to review the questions being asked by asking them in slightly different ways to see how these changes in wording, and even format, might effect the results.

Of particular interest to users of the census data are what is commonly referred to as the 100 Percent Items. These items are asked of all enumerated persons. The importance of the 100 Percent Item is that block level data is possible because each and every person responds to these items. And, of course, all of the higher level area geography can be aggregated as well. There are nine 100% items for which great detail and many publications are available. These items, therefore, are considered very important. The sample items consist of 45 additional questions which are asked of approximately 20 percent of the population. In places with less than 2,500 people one out of every two persons or 50 percent of those individuals will receive a sample form. For places greater than 2,500 one out of every six persons or approximately 16.7% of all person will receive a large sample form.

The content related to minority populations has expanded dramatically in the 1980 census. The race item has been expanded to include a greater number of Asia American groups, and some East Indian categories. The Hispanic/Spanish origin or descent item is a new item and is now a 100 Percent Item. As I mentioned earlier, 100 Percent Items are important because they allow for the greatest amount of geographic detail and because most information is published. Thus, the 1980 census and ensuing publications through the 1980s will have more information than ever before on the Hispanic origin population. This Hispanic/Spanish origin item is much like the one used in the Current Population Survey, a self identification item. Persons are allowed to identify themselves as being of Spanish origin and then of a particular type of Spanish origin: Mexican, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and so forth. These items will provide the basis upon which many policy and planning decisions will be made in the 1980s. And I would hope that all researchers interested in the area of labor take a look at the possibilities for utilizing this data in their own work.

A third item that I could mention is that the state of birth or foreign country of birth is going to be available once again. There

is a loss in the 1980 census of a question found in the 1970 census, namely, parent's country of birth. That item, unfortunately, will not be available in 1980.

A fourth item is the citizenship and year of immigration item. This item is much like the one that appeared in 1970 and simply asks foreign born persons to list their year of immigration and to note if they have been naturalized as citizens.

A fifth item which is of importance to the Hispanic researcher is that of current language and English proficiency. This is a new item for the 1980 census. The 1970 census relied on a mother tongue item. As you may recall, this is an item which asks whether a foreign language was spoken in the home when this respondent was a child. That item has given way to a new question which asks whether a non-English language is currently used. If the answer is yes that item is followed-up with, which language? The person can write in "Spanish" and this is then followed-up further with another question which asks, whether an individual speaks the non-English language as well as English, about equal to English, or less well than English. This language usage item will provide researchers with valuable data on language usage and proficiency.

On the sample items the ancestry question will allow individuals to write in their ancestry. This question allows for the identification of white ethnics and other ethnic mixtures not previously categorized. People who are Polish, and German, and so forth, will have an opportunity at this point to identify their ethnicity. If the write-ins are codable and we do have some problems with multiple categories, we should be able to obtain some rather interesting data on the status of ethnic and racial minorities in the United States.

A new item that I would like to describe for researchers is that of disability. For the first time the Census Bureau will try to measure disability. Although the questions are less than satisfactory, it does give us the opportunity to look at this significant issue. The item asks respondents whether they are hindered in certain activities as a result of long term illness or disability which has persisted for at least six months. The extent to which physical disability affects labor force participation is an important question which we should be able to respond to when these data are available.

The Census Bureau traditionally asks questions regarding labor force participation, i.e., what were your activities in the last week? primary occupation? place of employment etc.? In addition, for persons who report being unemployed, a new question has been added which is called Weeks Looking For Work In 1979. In this item we are trying to measure the extent of discouraged unemployed workers. The Bureau has never collected this information before and its value remains to be determined, but it is hoped that it will permit analysts to locate concentrations of individuals who are actively seeking work

without success. With this information, the extent of the issue and the magnitude of the problem may finally be identified.

Finally, another item which concerns us is income, by source of income. Given the significance of the underemployment among Hispanics, the earnings and wages items will allow for the analysis of progress in socioeconomic status.

Most of these items have appeared in the census before and a few others are new but never before have Hispanic researchers had the opportunity to work with so many important, and relevant variables. It is a real challenge for Hispanic researchers to consider the possibilities. I think we are going to find that there is enough work and enough data for us to analyze and reanalyze for some time to come.

An Overview of the Census Procedures

In terms of the enumeration procedures I simply want to remind you that the Bureau will utilize a mail out, mail back procedure. Ninety percent of the country is enumerated by mailing out questionnaires and expecting them to be returned on April 1, 1980. In the remainder of the country, a conventional method, consisting of mailing the forms out and then having an enumerator pick them up door-to-door will be used in rural areas. Most of you here live in cities and so you can expect to receive a Census form in the mail. But a few of you who live out in the country, or in West Texas or in Northern New Mexico, will find that you will receive a census form in the mail, but you will be asked to hold onto it until someone comes by to pick it up.

The area of policy analysis and policy making has emerged in the last decade as an important and significant area. Policy makers are those individuals who prepare for decision makers, options upon which important political, programmatic, and planning decision are made. Hispanics have for the most part not taken place in that process.

Relevance of Using Federal Statistics

One of the areas in which growing interest has emerged over this past few years is the areas of minority employment, youth employment, and female participation in the labor force. Certainly Hispanics have the abilities to provide guidance in the development of programs in these areas. But to participate requires that Hispanic researchers become involved in the process of analyzing data which is acceptable in the sense that it is considered valid and reliable by decision makers. Census data serves this purpose. We must however approach this task systematically and with a clear sense of priorities. Haphazard analysis, while interesting, will not be fruitful.

Those who are aware of some of the issues and concepts in the Youth Initiative Act, the new employment programs, and some of the new

public service employment programs for senior citizens can use this knowledge to guide your research more effectively. When we guide our research along the lines of some of the urgent policy issues, it is not to say that we cannot do other things as well, but unless we concern ourselves with the national employment issues we cannot participate in the process by which program heads make decisions about how program funds will be spent and on what emphasis or priorities will be given to various programs.

We are living in an era where quantitative data speaks louder than words in terms of programmatic needs. When we talk about needs assessment, we are usually talking about the results of a survey or data provided by the Census Bureau to indicate the extent of need. When we talk about planning we must look at data to determine where target groups reside and how large they are. Planners also rely heavily on census data or other sources of data. The game plan today is whether or not we, as Hispanics, can provide the evidence that we have the need for additional programs or for reemphasis of existing programs.

We can only take part in this process if we are willing to participate in relevant analysis of existing data, including the census, and of course, in disseminating those findings among ourselves and among others with the ability to utilize and build policy which benefits the Hispanic population.

The task before us has multiple stages. The first, of course, is to wait until the 1980 census data becomes available in mid 1981. The second stage is to develop a network of scholars who are aware of the policy issues which we as researchers identify as having the highest priority. Third, an effort must be made to disseminate the findings of these studies to people who can have an affect upon existing policies. And finally, we can begin to think along the lines of creating our own policy institutes to take the initiative on policy issues rather than continue to react to what other people have tried to accomplish.

So the 1980s should be an exciting time for Hispanic data analysts. Certainly the 1980 census will provide a beginning and I expect that additional surveys will provide us with more timely data bases. These new opportunities to develop a base of knowledge will bring us closer to that process of policy making, planning, and decision making and will provide an appropriate role of Hispanic researchers in the future.

THE HISPANIC RESEARCH CENTER

Rosemary Santana-Cooney*

Dr. Lloyd H. Rogler, who is the founder and director of the Hispanic Research Center, was the one originally asked to talk about some of the data sources and activities at the Hispanic Research Center. Since he was unable to be here today, he asked me to serve in his stead. He asked me to be brief and to the point, so I will try to do that. I have left some brochures on the Hispanic Research Center in the back of the room for those of you who are interested in looking at them later. I have also left several copies of our first two monographs. If you are interested in them or interested in more copies, please feel free to write to us.

The Hispanic Research Center is the youngest of six research and development centers supported by the Minority Group Division of the National Institute of Mental Health. NIMH funded two Hispanic-oriented centers: one on the western seaboard located at UCLA, and the Hispanic Research Center on the eastern seaboard located on the Fordham University campus in the Bronx county of New York City. We officially opened in the fall of '77 and thus are presently in the third year of our five year grant. When we originally opened, the name of the center was the Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research and Development Center because of our funding from NMIH. But the mental health words were problematic. We received innumerable calls from persons in the Hispanic community who thought we were a mental health clinic. Thus, they were interested in discussing personal problems they were having with their husband, wife, other relatives with a staff member. This misunderstanding led to an official name change to the Hispanic Research Center.

The Hispanic Research Center has several major objectives, two of which I will briefly mention today. A primary objective is to conduct interdisciplinary research related to the mental health of the Hispanic population. Several research projects underway at HRC are focused on mental health, such as psychiatric symptoms, use of health care facilities, and of therapeutic programs. HRC, however, has consistently recognized, as equally important, the broader conception of mental health that stresses social and economic well-being. Within this context, work, unemployment, underemployment, and earnings inadequacy are all centrally relevant to understanding the problems

*Dr. Rosemary Santana-Cooney is Senior Research Associate at the Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University.

and future prospects of the Hispanic community. Three research projects at HRC contain information related to the concerns of this conference.

The Puerto Rican family project includes data on 400 persons who are inter-generationally linked to form 100 units. That is, we have detailed information on mother, father, child and spouse of child for each inter-generational unit. These data were collected from July '76 through May '78 in the New York metropolitan area. The data set includes information on the migration experience, job history, Spanish and English language ability, perceptions of discrimination, earnings, and income from other sources, perceptions and evaluations of work and opportunity in the U.S. as compared with Puerto Rico. The data also include important information on cultural and sex role values. Because many explanations of the low participation rate of Puerto Rican women have stressed the cultural factor, these latter variables enable us to directly test this explanation. The inter-generational design is unique and allows direct comparisons of the work experience of the first generation migrant parent generation with that of their second generation children who are predominantly born and raised in the U.S.

Another important project related to the concerns of this conference is the Cuban project. Data were gathered in the summer of '79 on 300 households in the community of West New York. This area contains the second largest concentration of Cubans outside of Miami, Florida. The data set includes information on the migration experience, Spanish and English language ability, job history, as well as information on employment training programs, detailed description of present job, job satisfaction, job adjustment attitudes, and whether they are utilizing their education and training skills acquired in Cuba. In addition, information on various dimensions of assimilation is included. A particularly interesting aspect of this research is that it represents a replication and extension of a study on the same community ten years earlier.

It is noteworthy that Ginzberg's comments (those comments read earlier by Howard Rosen) stressed the importance of looking at and studying broader social cultural changes for Hispanic groups, both of these data sets are useful in this regard. They both include important cultural information in conjunction with work behavior and attitudes, information that complements and goes beyond the limited information available in the Census or CPS. I am hopeful that these data, together with the rich information available in the National Chicano Survey, can help us better understand the economic situation of the three largest Hispanic groups, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. The analyses of the Puerto Rican and Cuban data are in the works. Dr. Rogler has in the past encouraged doctoral students and other researchers interested in Hispanics to work together with other staff members on these data. Thus, I would be happy to talk further with those of you who are interested in these data.

The third project related to the conference is currently being reviewed by a grant funding agency. This research recognizes the growing importance of non Puerto Rican Hispanics in New York City. From 1975 marriage records in New York City we found that the proportion of Hispanics that are Dominican, Columbian and from other Central and South American countries, had increased dramatically since 1970. The central goal of this research project will be to study how the process of settlement, that is the transition from moving back and forth between countries, becomes one of more permanent residence and to analyze how this process is related to the employment situation, to assimilation and adjustment. Plans are to include a detailed migration and job history.

A second major objective that goes hand in hand with the research objective is to develop links between individual Hispanic researchers and between those persons involved in the formulation and implementation of Hispanic relevant public policies. Two important communication links, at present, are the Hispanic Research Center Bulletin and the Monograph Series. The Bulletin published quarterly and distributed to over 200 public policy makers, community leaders and researchers over the country includes highlights of on-going Hispanic research projects and news briefs related to social and economic well being of Hispanic groups. Major policy recommendations are integral to the Monograph Series. We have published three monographs: Puerto Ricans in Health; Hispanic Intermarriage; and Hispanic Experience in the Criminal Justice System. The commitment, however, to formulating links between policy and research, goes beyond writing words. To insure the word is heard and read, the Hispanic Research Center schedules and hosts a seminar inviting public policy makers, community leaders, and news media to discuss the proposed recommendations. While interpersonal interaction is only a first step towards bridging the gap between researchers and policy makers, it is an important first step.

THE NATIONAL CHICANO SURVEY

Carlos Arce*

The National Chicano Survey is the flagship in the flotilla of research and training efforts in the social and behavioral sciences focusing on the Chicano population of the United States. I am going to speak only about our survey, some of its characteristics and its potential for the study of Chicanos as workers. We define the population surveyed as people of Mexican ancestry, regardless of the number of generations removed from Mexican birth. We defined our sample population as co-heads of household with such ancestry. In various parts of the United States, we utilized bilingual questionnaires for face to face interviews, which I will talk about, involving extensive screening of the ancestry of residents in sample households to identify people who met the criteria, for inclusion in the Mexican ancestry population.

The substantive focus of our study, is not on work per se or workers or on participation in the labor force. First, the focus is on social identity and its various dimensions: group consciousness, collective consciousness, the development of ideology and the consequent actions, collective actions, which people perform on behalf of the individual or the group. Second, is on the area of mental health, the Chicano epistemology of mental health, and the patterns, networks, strategies of help seeking and social support that the Chicanos have developed. Within these two areas are various sub-topics which are very relevant to the study of workers. One is the family, in particular sex roles, conjugal roles, conjugal decision making, aspirations for the children, linguistic aspirations, language behavior, and the contextual character of language use. And third, explicit to our discussion today, was the study of work and attitudes and experiences regarding work.

In the original research design, we expected to conduct approximately 2,000 interviews from approximately 2,500 identified individuals of Mexican descent. A number of complex, difficult problems were encountered in field work. The expense of field work and a number of other reasons that I would be glad to share with you after my 10 minutes are up, caused us to reduce the sample size from the original 2,500 to approximately 1,400 of which only 1,000 individuals were interviewed.

*Dr. Carlos Arce is Project Director of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan.

Initially 80% of the sample was made of people of Mexican ancestry living in the Southwest, 10% living in the Chicago metropolitan area, and the remaining 10% residing in other parts of the non-Southwest. Our sample has as primary sampling units 17 standard metropolitan statistical areas. These are the 17 SMSAs which have the largest population of people of Mexican ancestry and include places such as Fresno, Anaheim, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, in California, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, El Paso, Houston, San Antonio, McAllen, in Texas; as well as, the metropolitan areas of Chicago, Albuquerque, Denver, and Phoenix. In addition to these "self-representing" areas, we selected a number of other sampling units in each state. In the state of Texas, for example, we included places like Beaumont, Ft. Worth, Laredo, several non-metropolitan counties like Comal, the New Braunfels area, or Wilson, Floresville area, Williamson county north of Austin, and Willacy county in southmost Texas, near Cameron County.

Finally, we generated a sample of 1,493 of those, we interviewed about one thousand, one thousand plus or minus two or three persons. That is an interview rate of only 67%. The problems of non-response are immense, and I would be glad to share them with you.

There is a great deal more I can say about the characteristics of the sample or the size of the sample, and I would be glad to have a dialogue with any of you who are interested in that aspect. I have put together a little handout on the content of our questions which have to do with work. The handout is basically an outline, a conceptual outline of the kinds of questions that we asked in the national survey, the kinds of questions regarding work, participation in the labor force, labor market experience, etc. The questionnaire, as I indicated earlier, is a bilingual questionnaire; it is in English on one side of the page and Spanish on the other side. It is a long questionnaire, three hours long. The parts that you are going to see are verbatim versions of many of the questions that we used, but are not presented in the manner in which the questionnaire was formatted. The outline that is on the first page of the handout has six groups of topics or concepts in which we developed questions.

I do not want to go through them all; I want to highlight two or three only. And since you are keeping that handout, you can later on look through it and discuss it. You might see that above each question there is a number, a typed number in italics; that number or numbers corresponds to the variable numbering in our data set. The full questionnaire as indicated on page two can be gotten from me, if you write me a postcard or a letter.

The divisions that I organized for you here are basic labor force characteristics: for people who have never worked, people who are not working but have worked at one point in their lives, and people that are currently working. We also gathered occupation in industry characteristics of spouse, husband or wife, according to the person whom

we interviewed. I would like to just point out a couple of, I think, very useful and important series of questions which I am particularly proud of.

The questions like job searching, that is section D, for people who are working or who are looking for work, or who are looking for additional work, we think are very important. We generated for a total sample for virtually all the people, very rich data on the mechanisms that Chicanos use for locating and securing employment, those are on page 6.

Section E deals with supervision exercised by a respondent on other workers or supervision exercised upon the respondent. Also it provides information on the pace of the work, the quantity of work expected, work attitudes, and assessments of the adequacy of pace, and of work. Reports of the flexibility of jobs are under item 4 on page 7 and in the summary.

Our data set is especially rich not only in the materials that you have in front of you, but in other things in the questionnaire. It is especially rich in people's reports or people's perceptions of structural conditions in our society, such as prejudice and discrimination regarding employment, regarding the work place, regarding the use of Spanish, regarding educational opportunities. Those questions which are specifically related to discrimination and opportunity in the work place are in Section F of the handout.

You can conceptualize any of these questions in a different fashion depending on your interest in the kinds of questions you would want to ask. I organized it in terms of reports and perceptions of opportunity, reports of discrimination towards individuals themselves or other individuals, discrimination that is more structural. The reports are of the manner in which the work place is segregated by race or ethnicity, and the extent to which the place in which people work is divided into some jobs for Mexican and some jobs for the others.

Given the rich opportunities that we have for discussing these things, I invite you once more to engage with me, or with several other people who are familiar with our survey, in details of the content of our questioning.

We pointed out that we are now processing the data, we are key punching portions of it, probably 60% or 70% for the variables are being processed now. We expect that in the next couple of months we will have a partially clean data set that will be useful for the beginning of data reduction and the beginning of analysis. Depending on our ability to muscle the resources to complete the processing of the data, we expect that by the end of this year we will have available some portions of the data for other interested researchers, including as many of you as are interested.

MEASUREMENT OF LABOR FORCE AND WORK-RELATED
PHENOMENA IN THE NATIONAL CHICANO SURVEY

Topical Outline and Question Content*

Two substantial sections of the interview schedule used in the national survey of people of Mexican ancestry were almost exclusively on questions relating to work and labor force experiences. In this brief outline, the questionnaire content is presented to demonstrate the conceptual approach, question wording, and question flow which were followed in the interviews. There are, in addition, numerous other questions directly relevant to the study of Chicanos and work--including respondent background, occupational origins, migration history, and basic demographics--which are located in other sections of the questionnaire and which will form a part of the total data set for analysis. There are, as well, other concepts and phenomena--ethnic identity and collective consciousness, perceptions of discrimination, reported psychological well-being, language status and attitudes, etc.--which were also incorporated into our study. In this handout, we only include the items from the two "work" sections. The question sequence in the questionnaire is not the same as the sequence presented here, which has been ordered to allow for efficient discussion of the work history items.

- A. Basic labor force status
 - 1. Never worked for pay
 - 2. Not presently working but previously in labor force
 - 3. Presently working
 - 4. Married, any labor force status
- B. Characteristics of current or most recent job
 - 1. Weeks and hours worked
 - 2. Wages
 - 3. Benefits
 - 4. Income
 - 5. Employer and union status
 - 6. Educational requirements of present job
 - 7. Training requirements of present job
- C. Job history and mobility
 - 1. Job history
 - 2. Periods out of labor force
 - 3. Moving for job reasons
 - 4. Prior better job
- D. Job searching
 - 1. Working
 - 2. Looking for work
 - 3. Not looking for work

*Prepared for the Symposium on Hispanics and CETA, The University of Texas, San Antonio, 1/31/80

- E. Work conditions and attitudes toward them
 - 1. Supervision
 - 2. Work pace
 - 3. Work quantity
 - 4. Job flexibility
 - 5. Summary satisfaction
- F. Labor market opportunities and discrimination
 - 1. Opportunity and effort for advancement
 - 2. Perceived individual discrimination
 - 3. Perceived structural discrimination
 - 4. Perceived constraints on advancement

QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT

With very few exceptions the text of questions below follows the English version of the National Chicano Survey questionnaire. In the few instances in which it does not, the change only clarifies the flow and sequence of this presentation. The numbers in italics are the variable numbers in the NCS data set. The questionnaire, which is printed in English and Spanish, side to side, is available upon request from C. H. Arce, Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan, Box 1248, Ann Arbor, Mi 48106. A code book of mostly fixed response alternative items in the interview will be available in Spring 1980. We hope to make most of the data available to interested users by late 1980.

A. BASIC LABOR FORCE STATUS

1. If never worked for pay:

What are the reasons you have never worked? Was there ever a time in your life when you wanted to get a job? (If yes: When was that? What happened that you didn't find work?)

2. If not presently working but previously in labor force:

What was the last work you did for money? What kind of business or industry was that in? When did you first start working at that job? When did you stop working at that job? What are the reasons why you have not worked since then? Has there been a time since then when you wanted to have a job? (If yes: When was that? What happened that you didn't find work?)

3. If presently working:

How many jobs or work for pay do you presently have? What is your main job or occupation - the kind of work you normally do? What kind of business or industry is this job in?

4. If married:

What kind of work does your husband/wife do? What kind of business or industry is this in?

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB

1. Weeks and hours worked:

How many weeks did you work on this job during 1978? And on the average, how many hours a week did you work on this job during that time? Does this include overtime? (If yes: On the average about how many hours per week were overtime?) Did you work any overtime not included in the hours you just told me? (If yes: On the average about how many overtime hours a week was that?)

2. Wages:

Now I would like to ask you a couple of questions about your job. How are you paid on the job -- regular salary, by the hour, by piece work, or some other way? How much do you earn? If you were to work more hours than usual, would you get paid for these extra hours of work? (If yes: How much do you earn per overtime hour?)

3. Benefits:

Now I'd like to ask about benefits in your job. Do you receive health insurance that covers any illness or injury off the job? ...life insurance that would cover a death for reasons not connected with the job? ...a retirement program? ...paid sick leave? ...paid vacation? ...paid maternity/ paternity leave? ...free child care? ...any other benefit? Were you laid off or unemployed at any time in 1977 or 1978? (If yes: Altogether how long were you out of work? Did you get any unemployment insurance benefits while you were out of work?)

4. Income:

During the year 1978, did you receive money in any of the following ways: Salary from jobs? Dividends? Interest from savings? Social security? Public assistance? Any other way? Now would you look at this card; could you please tell me which letter comes closest to the total income of your family last year? This income figure should include all salaries, pensions, and other income sources (16 categories of income).

5. Employer and union status:

Do you work for someone else, yourself, or what? Do you work for the federal, state, or local government? Is your job covered by a union contract? (If yes: Do you belong to that union?)

6. Educational requirements of present job:

Do people have to have a high school diploma to get a job like yours? (If yes: do they have to have more schooling than that? [If yes: What do they have to have?]) If no: Do they have to have any schooling? [If yes: What do they have to have?])

7. Training requirements of present job:

Do people have to have some work experience or special training to get a job like yours? (If yes: What kind of experience or training is that?) If a person had the proper training to get the job, how long would it take that person to learn to do your job?

C. JOB HISTORY AND MOBILITY

1. Job History:

At what age did you get your very first job for pay? What was that job? Now, please think about the first full-time job you had. Do not count part-time jobs, jobs during school vacation, or jobs without pay; how old were you when you began this job? What kind of work were you doing? What kind of business or industry was this job in? Before the position you have now, did you start another position with this same employer? (If yes: What was your first position for this employer? When did you get that position? And when did you get the current position? a. In your position, is your pay better, worse, or the same as when you started there? b. Other than pay, is your present position better or worse than when you started? In what ways?)

2. Periods out of labor force:

Now, I'd like to know about the times you've worked in your like, and the times you haven't worked. Since your first started working on full-time basis, has there ever been a time, of at least a couple of months, when you were not working? Has there ever been a period of time--of at least a couple of months--when you weren't able to work because you were sick or had a physical ability? (If yes: How often has this happened since you first began working?) How

about raising children or other family responsibilities. Has there ever been a time when you didn't work because of these responsibilities. (If yes: How often has this happened since you first began working?) Has there ever been a period of time when you were looking for work but couldn't get a job? (If yes: How often has this happened since you first began working?) Have you ever been in the military service? (If yes: How old were you when you first began your military duty?)

3. Moving for job reasons:

Did you ever move from one city to another or one state to another or from one country to another in order to get a job or to look for one? (If yes: How old were you when you first moved because of work? What place did you move from? What place did you move to? What work did you do before you moved? What work did you do after you moved? How old were you when you moved for the last time because of work? What place did you move from? What place did you move to? What work did you do before you moved? What work did you do after you moved?)

4. Prior better job:

Did you ever have a job that was better than your present or most recent job? (If yes: What was that job? When did you leave that job? How was that job better? Why did you leave that job?)

D. JOB SEARCH

1. If working:

We are interested in how people hear about jobs and how they get them. How did you first hear about a job with your current employer--did you hear about this job through State Employment Service? ...private employment agency? ...a community organization? ...applying directly to the employer? ...friends, acquaintances or neighbors? ...relatives? ...someone/something else? (If from a person: you said you heard about the job from some person or persons. Did that person(s) work at the place you work(ed)? Who was that? Would you like another job now--either a difference one or an additional job? (If yes: Are you trying to find a job?)

2. If looking or trying for a job (whether employed or not):

How long have you been trying? Are you trying for something at the place where you work, somewhere else, or what? What

have you done? Here is a list of ways some people look for jobs. Are you using State Employment Service? ...another government agency like welfare? ...private employment agency? ...a community organization? ...teachers, counselors, placement officer in school or training program? ...a want ad in newspapers, magazines or TV and radio? ...a posted notice somewhere else? ...present or previous employer or other people with whom you have worked? ...a labor union? ...Civil Service test or application? ...friends, acquaintances, or neighbors? ...applying directly to an employer? ...relatives? ...someone/something else? How hard has it been for you to find what you want, almost impossible, very difficult, fairly easy, or very easy? Why has it been that way?

3. If not looking:

What are the reasons you're not looking for work? If you were offered a job of the kind you want, would you probably take it, maybe take it, or probably not take it? Would it depend on good pay? ...that it is not too far away? ...good hours? ...whether it affects your studies? ...whether it affects your family responsibilities? ...whether you really need the money?

E. WORK CONDITIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD THEM

1. Supervision:

In your job, do you supervise the work of others, or tell them what to do? (If yes: do you have any say or influence in the pay, promotions or disciplining of the people who work under you?) Do you have a supervisor who watches your work or talks to you about it at least once a month? (If yes: how often does this happen? Does this help or bother you? Why is that? [If bothers: how much does it bother you; does it bother you alot, some, or a little?])

2. Work pace:

Some people have jobs where they can take time off when the need to, or take their breaks when they want to. Is your job this way? (If no: why is that? How much does this bother you; does it bother you alot, some, or not at all?) Who decides how fast you work; is it decided by you, by your supervisor, or who? Do machines affect how fast you work? Is the pace you have to work at too fast, about right, or too slow?

3. Work quantity:

Who decides how much work you do--is it decided by you, your supervisor, or who? Can you tell me a little more about how this decision gets made? Is the amount of work you have to do too much, about right, or not enough?

4. Job Flexibility:

Do you have enough freedom to carry out the job the way you want to? (If yes: can you give me an example of that? If no: why is that?)

5. Summary satisfaction:

Now I'd like you to think of your job--how well would you say it provides good pay--very well, fairly well, or not too well? ...good stability and security? ...training opportunities? ...good chances for promotion? ...good supervisor? ...getting along with co-workers? ...good work conditions? ...being able to decide how work is carried out? ...interesting work? ...good fringe or job benefits? ...not getting too tired? ...good work hours? How hard would it be for you to find another job that paid the same as this job; very easy, fairly easy, very difficult, or almost impossible? All in all, how satisfied are you with your job--would you say very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?

F. LABOR MARKET OPPORTUNITIES AND DISCRIMINATION

1. Opportunity and effort for advancement:

Let's talk a little more about your job, are there any jobs better than yours at the place where you work? (If yes: what are your chances for promotion into one of those better jobs--are they very good, not too good, or not good at all? Would you like to be promoted? Why is that?) Have you ever been promoted at the place where you work? (If yes: when was the last time you were promoted? If no: why do you think you have 't been?) Have you ever tried to change what you were doing--for example, entered a training program, or gone back to school, or tried to go into a different type of work--things that would change what you were doing? (If yes: what did you try to do? How much better was your situation after you tried something different, did your situation get much better, a bit better, it didn't change, or did it get worse? What happened? Why would you say it worked out that way? Did it cost you anything because you had to pay for it or lost salary when you did that?)

2. Perceived individual discrimination:

Compared to an Anglo person, would a person of Mexican descent have an easier time, about the same, or a harder time getting a job like yours? Compared to a Black person, would a person of Mexican descent have an easier time, about the same, or a harder time getting a job like yours? Compared to a White person, would a Black person have an easier time, about the same, or a harder time getting a job like yours? Have you ever been treated badly in your job because you are of Mexican descent? (If yes: in what way? Have you tried to do something about this? [If yes: what have you done? If no: what could be done?]) Do you feel that being of Mexican descent has had anything to do with your chances for promotion or getting jobs you wanted; has it helped you, held you back, or meant nothing in your case? Why is that? Do you know someone who has been denied a job or promotion because they are of Mexican descent? Compared to a man, would a woman have an easier time, about the same, or a harder time getting a job like yours? Women: do you think that being a woman has had anything to do with your chances for promotion or getting jobs you wanted; has it helped you, held you back, or meant nothing in your case? Men: do you think that being a man has had anything to do with your chances for promotions or getting jobs you wanted; has it helped you held you back, or meant nothing in your case? Do you know of any woman who has been denied a job or a promotion because she is a woman?

3. Perceived structural discrimination:

In the place where you work, do people of Mexican descent tend to have certain kinds of jobs? (If yes: what jobs are those? Do those jobs pay better, the same, or worse than the jobs people of Mexican descent don't have? Are the working conditions on those jobs better, the same, or worse than on jobs they don't have? And are the chances for promotion better, the same or worse than on jobs they don't have? Why do you think workers of Mexican descent have those kinds of jobs? How often do workers of Mexican descent move up to better jobs at the place where you work--hardly ever, sometimes, or often? Is your job one that workers of Mexican descent tend to have at the place where you work?)

4. Perceived constraints on advancement:

There are many reasons people don't get the jobs that they've wanted. First, how about family responsibilities, did that ever keep you from the positions or jobs you wanted? How about transportation problems? How about your

not having enough or the right work experience? How about discrimination because of your age? How about employers not liking the way you spoke English? How about getting discouraged? How about just lack of ambition? How about bad luck--you didn't get the right breaks? How about not being ready to settle down to work? How about unions controlling jobs you might have wanted? How about there just being low-paying, dead-end jobs available?

THE NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEYS OF YOUTH LABOR MARKET EXPERIENCE

Richard Santos*

Introduction

The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) of Youth Labor Market Experience, Youth Surveys, will consist of annual interviews over a five-year period with a national sample of approximately 11,400 young men and women between the ages of 14 and 21 on January 1, 1979, with overrepresentation of Blacks, Hispanics and poor Whites. In addition, approximately 1,300 persons in this age group serving in the military in 1978 are interviewed. To labor market researchers interested in Hispanic youth, the youth surveys represent one of the most timely and valuable data sources, because 2,000 of the youth are Hispanics. This Hispanic youth cohort can for research purposes be classified into Spanish origin groups: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Hispanic background individuals.

Responsibility for designing the surveys and analyzing the results rests with The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research. Under a subcontract with the Center, the National Opinion Research Center is responsible for sample design, field work, and data reduction. The surveys are an extension of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Behavior which have been conducted at the Center since 1966. The NLS surveys are sometimes more commonly known as the Parnes tapes. The youth surveys have been funded under a contract with the United States Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration. Supplementary funds have been transferred to DOL by the Department of Defense and the military services.

The youth surveys provide not only a wealth of information, but also research opportunities to social scientists interested in Hispanic youth. The tapes are public data sources and will become available on a yearly basis to interested researchers. Given the length of the presentation and vast information available from the surveys, areas which may be of special interest to Hispanic researchers will be highlighted. A more detailed list of the variables in the 1979 and 1980 surveys is noted in Table 1. In addition, information on how to obtain the data tapes will be presented.

*Dr. Richard Santos is Senior Research Associate at the Center for Human Resources Research, Ohio State University.

Labor Market Experience

Detailed information on the survey week force status and employment status is available. In addition to usual items such as hours worked per week, occupation, industry and rate of pay, the youths were asked about union membership, job satisfaction, size of employer, and fringe benefits. The job search techniques of youth are likewise available.

Human Capital and Other Socioeconomic Variables

Of interest to Hispanic researchers are variables pertaining to education, migration, birth place, language spoken in home, and health status. For example, nearly a quarter of Hispanic youth ages 14-21 are high school dropouts. In addition, preliminary analysis of the Hispanic cohort indicates a substantial number of foreign born.

Military Service

Information on military service activities is available for such areas as reason for entering, attitudes toward military service, time spent in the armed forces, and military occupation.

Social/Psychological

Attitudes toward women working, knowledge of world of work, Rotter score, and other measures of self-esteem can be examined among youth. In addition, the various perceptions of age, race, sex, and language barriers to employment among youth can be ascertained.

Other Information

In the 1980 survey, additional questions will be asked. For example, information pertaining to school discipline, delinquency and drugs, and police contacts will be generated. A school survey will also be administered in 1980 to the high school last attended by respondents. It will provide information on the schools attended by youth, courses taken, grades, and other test scores. In future surveys, other items of information which will add to the overall data base on youth will be included.

Data Availability

The Center for Human Resource Research has assumed the responsibility of making revised National Longitudinal Surveys data tapes and documentation available to the research community at the (marginal) cost of producing them. Dr. Michael E. Borus is the Director of the Center and is co-principal investigator of the surveys with Dr. Herbert S. Parnes. The Center expects to make the 1979 interview data available in the late summer of 1980, a little more than one year

after the interviews. In addition to the data tapes, each public use order includes a codebook, which describes and defines each variable, indicates its location on the data file, and presents its frequency distribution.

Social scientists who are interested in doing research on Hispanic youth and other NLS related areas are encouraged to contact the Center about data availability. In order to facilitate information about the NLS, the Center published a quarterly NLS Newsletter and NLS Handbook. The NLS Newsletter provides general information about ongoing and completed projects and other areas of special interest. The NLS Handbook provides more basic information such as details for ordering the data tapes and a bibliography of research which uses the NLS. Persons wishing to receive the NLS Newsletter and Handbook should contact the NLS Users Office, Center for Human Resources Research, 5701 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085.

TABLE 1

NLS Variables for Youth 14-21, by Survey Year

Variable	1979	1980
I. Labor Market Experience Variables		
A. Current Labor Force and Employment Status and Characteristics of Current Job		
Survey week labor force and employment status	*	*
Occupation (Census code)	*	*
Occupation (DOL code)	*	*
Industry	*	*
Class of worker	*	*
Starting date	*	*
Number of hours worked in survey week	*	*
Number of hours per week usually worked	*	*
Shift worked	*	*
Hourly rate of pay	*	*
Commuting time to current job	*	*
Covered by collective bargaining?	*	*
Is respondent union member?	*	*
Availability of vacation and insurance benefits on current job	*	*
Reason for leaving last job	*	*
Job satisfaction	*	*
Job characteristics inventory	*	*
Size of employer	*	*
Minority status of co-workers and supervisor	*	*
B. Work Experience since January 1, 1978 or Previous Survey		
Number of weeks worked	*	*
Number of hours usually worked per week	*	*
Number of weeks unemployed	*	*
Spells of unemployment	*	*
Number of weeks out of labor force	*	*
C. Characteristics of Jobs with More Than 20 Hours per Week and More Than 9 Weeks in Duration since January 1, 1978		
Occupation (Census code)	*	*
Industry	*	*
Class of worker	*	*
Starting date	*	*
Number of hours per week usually worked	*	*
Hourly rate of pay	*	*
Covered by collective bargaining?	*	*
Is respondent union member?	*	*
Reason for leaving job	*	*

Variable	1979	1980
II. Human Capital and Other Socioeconomic Variables		
A. Early Formative Influences		
Nationality and birthplace	*	
Ethnic self-identification	*	
Person(s) respondent lived with at age 14	*	
Occupation of primary male adult and primary female adult when respondent was 14	*	
Highest grade of school completed by father	*	
Highest grade of school completed by mother	*	
Birthplace of parents	*	
Were magazines available in home at age 14?	*	
Were newspapers available in home at age 14?	*	
Was library card available in home at age 14?	*	
Current and past religion	*	
Whether language other than English spoken when respondent was a child	*	
B. Migration		
Counties of residence since January 1, 1978	*	*
C. Education		
Current enrollment status	*	*
Highest grade of school completed	*	*
Reason stopped attending high school	*	*
Date of last enrollment	*	*
Is (was) school public or private?	*	*
High school curriculum	*	*
College degree received	*	*
Type of college attending	*	*
Field of specialization in college	*	*
College tuition	*	*
Financial aid in college	*	*
Attitude toward selected aspects of high school	*	*
Courses taken during last year of high school	*	*
D. Vocational Training outside Regular School		
Type(s) of training	*	*
Duration of training programs	*	*
Whether training was completed	*	*
Whether obtained degree, certificate or journeyman's card	*	*
Usual hours per week spent in training	*	*
E. Government Jobs and Training Programs		
Participation in programs	*	*
Type of program	*	*
Satisfaction with program	*	*
Participation in program of aid on subsequent jobs	*	*

Variable	1979	1980
Services provided by program	*	*
Length of participation in program	*	*
Hours per week and per day spent in program	*	*
Amount of income from participating in program	*	*
Aspects liked most and least about programs	*	
F. Health and Psysical Condition		
Does health limit work?	*	*
Duration of health limitation	*	*
Type of health problem (ICD-9 code)	*	*
G. Marital and Family Characteristics		
Marital status	*	*
Number of dependents	*	*
Are respondent's parents living?	*	*
Occupation of father and mother in past year	*	*
Number of weeks worked by father and mother in past year	*	*
Education of family members	*	*
Occupation of spouse	*	*
Periods of living away from parents	*	
Extent of work of spouse in survey year	*	*
Age at which respondent expects to marry	*	
Changes in marital status since January 1, 1978	*	*
Number and duration of marriages	*	*
Number and age distribution of children living in household	*	*
Expected number of children	*	
Number of children respondent considers ideal	*	
H. Financial Characteristics		
Total family income in previous year	*	*
Income of respondent (and spouse) from farm or own business in previous year	*	*
Income of respondent (and spouse) from wages or salary in previous year	*	*
Income of respondent (and spouse) from unemployment compensation in previous year	*	*
Income from public assistance in previous year	*	*
Income from food stamps in previous year	*	*
Income from pensions and Social Security	*	*
Income from other sources in previous year	*	*
I. Military Service (Current or Past)		
Branch of armed forces	*	*
Months spent in armed forces	*	*
Military occupation(s)	*	*

Variable	1979	1980
ROTC or officer training	*	*
Reserve or guard activities	*	*
Pay grade and income	*	*
Type and amount of military training	*	*
Formal education received while in service	*	*
Future military plans	*	*
Why entered military		*
Reason for leaving military		*
J. Work Attitudes		
Would respondent continue to work if he/she had enough money to live on?	*	
Characteristics of job respondent is willing to take (respondents unemployed or out of labor force)	*	*
Reaction to hypothetical job offers	*	
K. Educational and Occupational Aspirations and Expectations		
Would you like to receive more education or training? Type?	*	
How much education do you wish and do you think you will actually get?	*	
What kind of work would you like to be doing at age 35?	*	*
Expectation of achieving occupational goal	*	
L. Other Social/Psychological Variables		
Knowledge of world of work score	*	
Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control score (4 items)	*	
Attitude toward women working	*	
Rosenberg self-esteem (10 items)		*
M. Retrospective Evaluation of Labor Market Experience		
Perception of age discrimination	*	
Perception of race discrimination	*	
Perception of sex discrimination	*	
Reason for problems in obtaining employment	*	
N. Significant Others		
Person having most influence on respondent	*	
Responses of significant other to various situations	*	

Variable

1979

1980

O. School Discipline

Ever been suspended from school? Date

*

Ever been expelled from school? Date

*

P. Delinquency and Drugs

Activities within last year (20 items)

*

Income from illegal activities within last year

*

Q. Reported Police Contacts

Number of times stopped by police

*

Number of times booked or arrested

*

Number of convictions

*

Charges respondents has been convicted

*

Number of times incarcerated. Date of release

*

U.S. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS DATA ON PERSONS
OF HISPANIC ORIGIN

Harvey R. Hamel*

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you at this session of the UTSA symposium. As Dr. Levitan said, numbers are important, and I could not agree with him more on that. My remarks today will focus on the BLS program of Hispanic labor force data and the reports that emanate from that data. The BLS has accomplished a great deal in the expansion and publication of Hispanic labor force data during recent years. However, although much has already been accomplished, the Bureau is committed to further improvement in the Hispanic data program, and we are continually working toward that goal.

One of the pages in your symposium program includes a list of the data and reports on Hispanics which are available from the BLS. I would briefly like to discuss some of the contents of those reports with you. Hispanic data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) are published regularly by BLS in monthly, quarterly and annual reports. Monthly data on the employment status of Hispanics are published in the Employment Situation press release. For example, the data for the month of January, 1980, will be released on February 1 at 9:00 a.m. and will include the Hispanic unemployment rate for January. More detailed data on Hispanics, including employment status by age and sex; employment by occupation, industry, full- and part-time status; unemployment rates by age and sex; duration of unemployment; reason for unemployment; and the employment status of veterans; as well as separate data on persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin, are published quarterly. They appear in the January, April, July and October issues of our main statistical publication, Employment and Earnings.

All of the above labor force statistics, in addition to more detailed information on the occupation and industry of the employed and the status of persons who are outside the labor force (including discouraged workers) are published annually in the January issue of Employment and Earnings. We also publish periodic analytical reports or bulletins which either focus directly on the Hispanic worker or which include information on Hispanics as a part of the report. These are listed in your program along with a brief description of each

*Mr. Harvey R. Hamel is Senior Economist for the Office of Current Employment Analysis, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

report. One of the most popular articles on Hispanics entitled "Profile of Hispanics in the U.S. Work Force," was published in the December 1978 Monthly Labor Review. Reprints of that article are still available from the Bureau.

I would like to take this opportunity to tell you about a new Bureau report on Hispanic and Black workers entitled, "Employment In Perspective, Minority Workers". This new report, to be issued on a quarterly basis beginning in February, will focus on some particular aspect of the labor force each month. The first issue focuses on differences in minority unemployment rates and characteristics of the unemployed. We have established a mailing list of persons who are interested in receiving the report free on a regular basis. If you would like to receive the report, send your name and address to me in care of the Bureau--the address is included in the symposium program. If you would prefer, you may give me your name and address before I leave this afternoon.

Although, as I have indicated, much has been accomplished by the Bureau during the past two years, Hispanic data are still not as statistically reliable as the data for Black and White workers from the CPS. Hispanic data are collected from a relatively small sample and are subject to a larger degree of sampling error than the data for the majority population. In order to provide data for Hispanics which would be as timely and accurate as those which are currently available for Black Americans, for example, the CPS would have to be expanded and redesigned to take account of the most recent information available on residential patterns of Hispanics and the rest of the population from the 1980 census. This work will be completed following tabulation of results from the 1980 census.

For those of you who are not that familiar with the CPS, I will say a few words about the survey itself. As I am sure most of you know, it is the basic source of the nation's statistics on employment and unemployment. It is a sample survey of approximately 65,000 households conducted each month by the Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The survey provides comprehensive data on the labor force (i.e., the employed and the unemployed) including such characteristics as age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, marital status, occupation, industry, and several other related characteristics. The survey also provides information on persons outside the labor force; those who are neither employed nor unemployed. The information is collected by highly trained Census Bureau interviewers and the survey covers all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

We are often asked how Hispanics are identified in the survey and precisely who are included in that category. In the CPS, all persons self-identify their ethnic origin or descent. As they are asked the question on ethnic origin, respondents are shown a card which, in addition to many non-Hispanic categories, such as various European

nationalities, has seven specific Hispanic groups listed. They are: Mexican-American, Chicano, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or Southern American, and other Spanish origin. Persons indicating one or more of these categories as their ethnic origin or descent, are classified as being of Hispanic origin. In fact, persons are also asked to designate their race in the survey. The categories available are: White, Black, American Indian, Eskimo, and Asian or Pacific Islander.

As Dr. Levitan pointed out, the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics recently released their report, Counting the Labor Force, which specified 88 separate recommendations for improvements in the overall government program of labor force statistics. He also mentioned that the commission examined the quantity and quality of available labor force statistics on minorities, and he found that problems existed in the government's efforts to provide data that accurately reflect the labor force participation and economic status of minority groups.

The main problem is with the relatively small representation of minorities in the CPS, even though they are represented in the CPS in proportion to their percentage of the U.S. population. As the commission's report pointed out, the change in the monthly unemployment rate for Blacks must be about four times as large as that for Whites to have the same level of statistical significance; the change in the unemployment rate for Hispanics would have to be over six times that of Whites. The commission recommended, therefore, an expansion of the survey sample and improvement in the labor force data on minorities to provide the information needed by policy makers to measure accurately labor force movements among minority groups. Of course, implementation of these recommendations will come at a considerably high cost.

Specifically, regarding minority data, the commission recommended a doubling of the CPS sample size for minority households and establishment of methods similar to those which will be used in the 1980 census to identify minorities in the CPS. BLS and Bureau of Census Staff are currently working together to develop means for improving the reliability of the minority data.

The goal is to provide this improvement in the most efficient way possible. Several methodologies are being considered to implement the commission's recommendations. They include more effective stratification techniques, over sampling of selected areas with known high proportions of minorities, special screening procedures and sampling procedures in which specified relatives of household respondents would also be surveyed in addition to those who are living in the household. Results of this research may indicate that improvement in the reliability of the minority data will be possible partly through more efficient sampling and partly through sample expansion.

As you might imagine, the final choice of method will be determined by both feasibility and cost. In terms of the commission's

recommendation with regards to the methods used to identify minorities, I believe that the CPS methods which I described a few minutes ago are already in line with those to be used in the 1980 census.

The Bureau is also continuing its efforts to provide the much desired seasonally adjusted Hispanic labor force series that up to now has not been possible. A seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for Hispanics would allow valid analysis of monthly changes in the rate and more accurate comparisons with the rate for Blacks and Whites. Although recent tests have indicated that seasonally adjusted Hispanic data are not sufficiently reliable for publication, the Bureau is retesting the series with the aim of eventual publication of seasonally adjusted Hispanic data as soon as they meet Bureau criteria for statistical reliability.

At this time I would like to provide you with an over view of some of the current statistics on Hispanics published by BLS. Most of these data relate to the fourth quarter of 1979.

1. Of the more than 12 million reported persons of Hispanic origin there were about 8 million Hispanics of working age--that is, 16 years old and over during the 4th quarter of 1979. They comprised about 5 percent of all working age Americans. With a labor force participation rate of about 64 percent, they numbered about 5 million workers--3 million men and 2 million women.
2. The labor force participation rate of persons of Mexican and Cuban origin were both much higher than that of persons of Puerto Rican origin. In fact, the rate for persons of Puerto Rican origin was only about 50 percent compared to about 66 percent for persons of Mexican or Cuban origin.
3. Hispanics have historically had higher unemployment rates than the overall work force, and the most recent period was no exception. The unemployment rate for Hispanic workers was 8.6 percent during the 4th quarter of 1979, while among the overall US work force it was 5.6 percent--not seasonally adjusted.
4. The jobless rate for Hispanic men was considerably lower than that for Hispanic women, 6.8 percent compared with 11.4 percent.
5. Although their unemployment rates were higher than that for the total work force, the average (median) length of a spell of joblessness for Hispanic workers was less than that for the nation's unemployed--4.8 as compared with 5.4 weeks.
6. There were substantial differences in unemployment rates among the Hispanic ethnic groups. Puerto Ricans had the

highest unemployment rate--in the 4th quarter it was about 10 1/2 percent. The rate for persons of Mexican origin was not much below that--9.1 percent--while that for persons of Cuban origin was the lowest of the Hispanic groups--6.6 percent.

7. The proportion of Hispanic population with jobs, that is, the employment-population ratio, was 58 percent during the 4th quarter of 1979, somewhat less than that for the overall US work force--60.3 percent. As you might expect, there were large differences for men and women--76 percent of the Hispanic men were employed while only 43 percent of Hispanic women held regular jobs outside the home. The employment-population ratio was much lower for persons of Puerto Rican origin--about 45 percent--than for other Hispanic ethnic groups.
8. The Bureau also publishes limited data on the labor force status of persons of Hispanic origin in selected states and metropolitan areas. The data show that the Hispanic jobless rate in 1979 was lowest in Florida (5.7 percent) while it was highest in New York (10 1/2 percent). The rate for Hispanics in Texas and in the tri-state area of Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico, was about 7 to 7 1/2 percent, just under the U.S. Hispanic average.

As I mentioned earlier, most of the data that I have just described along with much more detail than I have time to provide today, are published regularly either in Employment and Earnings, in our monthly Employment Situation press release, in Special Labor Force Reports, and in other charts, books, and articles that we do. In addition, the first issue of the new quarterly report that I described to you, Employment in Perspective, Minority Workers, will be available in February.

THE PUERTO RICAN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

Jose Oscar Alers*

I am sure that all of you prior to this session were already very much aware of the institutional affiliations of my fellow panelists: the U.S. Census Bureau, Fordham University, Ohio State University, the University of Michigan, and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. I am also sure that very few of you have ever heard of the Puerto Rican Migration Research Consortium, so I will take a few minutes to describe it for you. We are an independent, private, non-profit corporation established in 1977. Our board of directors consists largely of professors, mostly from the New York area and from Puerto Rico. We are dedicated to doing research on Puerto Rican migration and its relationships to social institutions.

In the two and a half years that we have been in existence, we have prepared two pieces of published research, one monograph on Puerto Ricans and Health in New York City and a second monograph which has just been published the past week entitled, The Puerto Rican Struggle. The latter consists of a series of essays on the assimilation process as it affects Puerto Ricans in the United States. We have also administered a small-grants program under which we receive funds from the Ford Foundation to support a number of researchers around the country to do nine Puerto Rican studies, including two each on Hawaii and New York City and one on Puerto Rico, Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee and the U.S. as a whole.

In 1978, while we were pursuing our research objectives, we were especially struck by the severe problems that became quite obvious in the area of Puerto Rican unemployment. The data that were most current at that time and most striking referred to Puerto Rican youth. For male youth, ages 16 to 19, the unemployment rate in 1976 was 55%. That figure was the highest of the seven racial/ethnic groups analyzed. I am referring to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission report on Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women published recently on the basis of data from the Survey of Income and Education (SIE). Given this situation, the question is what can social science researchers do to combat a problem that has such a degree of severity. Another question is what kinds of data bases are available to us for research.

*Dr. Jose Oscar Alers is Coordinator at the Puerto Rican Migration Research Consortium, Inc., New York.

The census, as you are all aware, certainly is the most comprehensive source of information we have, including breakdowns for local areas which are quite important to a lot of agencies. But, of course, the decennial census is too infrequent for most purposes, and even with the five-year census, which is now mandated by the law, that would still be true.

In the case of national surveys, including the Current Population Survey, what generally happens with the continental Puerto Rican population is that sufficient number of cases is not available for analysis. The Puerto Ricans are 7/10 of 1% of the total population of the United States. Thus, any national survey that does not over-represent Puerto Ricans will simply not yield enough cases to do any kind of analysis. Also, of course, this further implies that there will be no local data available, there will be a high sample error, and there will be a very limited usefulness to the survey. I am speaking here of a situation in which Puerto Ricans are identified specifically. There are many surveys in which we are not even identified as a separate group at all. These surveys would, therefore, be completely useless to us.

The Current Population Survey, as indicated by Professor Levitan and by Mr. Hammel at this conference, is undergoing some changes which will try to overcome some of the problems we have with the national data sources, but prior to that an effort has been launched by all the major minority groups in the U.S. to overcome some of the data limitations I have just outlined. Out of that effort grew a National Chicano Survey, out of that grew national surveys being done by Blacks, out of that grew a national survey that is being done by Cubans, and also a survey that we ourselves--The Puerto Rican Consortium--are in the process of conducting. I will discuss the latter in more detail.

First of all, let me say that of all the sources that have been available until now, by far the most useful has been the SIE. Therefore, we are now, as part of our research, engaged in an analysis of the SIE data. We are in the process of mining them for whatever information we can get on Puerto Ricans. What we proposed to the Rockefeller Foundation two years ago is that we do this analysis of the SIE data and, insofar as it is insufficient, that we supplement this with our own national survey. And they agreed to support it. That made us another one of the minority groups which, because of dissatisfactions with the national data sources, has decided to go ahead and do it all on our own. Now, in turn, I think it is clear that these kinds of efforts have helped to stimulate the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other agencies to then go ahead and improve their data sources for minorities. This is "a consummation devoutly to be wished", to quote Shakespeare, and it is something that has happened.

As far as our survey is concerned, the subject is unemployment among Puerto Rican youth. The main feature we have in terms of the

types of data not included in previous studies, consists of detailed individual histories from 1951 to 1980. These can be tabulated by age, so that we can have age effects extracted from the questionnaire and also period effects. These data will make possible research on changes in residence, education, marital status, employment, and occupation on a year-by-year basis so that we can analyze that very carefully.

Of course, we will also be exploring the participation in training and employment programs of the Puerto Rican youth, both those who are employed and those who are not. And we will also be taking a look at important market factors which affect the situation of Puerto Rican employment.

As far as methodology is concerned, what we are designing is a national probability sample of about 1,000 Puerto Ricans, ages 14 to 29, who are located in approximately 20 "barrios". We define a "barrio" as a census tract in which there were 400 or more Puerto Ricans in the 1970 census and in which we can estimate through various techniques to find at least that many still living in 1980. In other words, we are focusing on the most densely concentrated inner-city, older, and established areas in which Puerto Ricans reside. This population as defined in this particular way, comprises about 55% of the total Puerto Rican population of the U.S. There are about 675 such "barrios" around the country.

Quite frankly, this particular focus was dictated in good part by limited funds. We have been interested in expanding the survey, but this design does now have the advantage that this is where the unemployment problem of Puerto Rican youth is most severe, so it makes sense to do it this way. With more funds, we would broaden the sample frame to cover all the United States, including Puerto Ricans outside of these "barrio" areas: the more dispersed population, which is also more educated, better situated, and very important in terms of work experience. We would also include the island of Puerto Rico, where, after all, most Puerto Ricans still live--60% of us.

In later waves, we hope to include other topics, such as labor force participation of Puerto Rican women and also the use of other methods, including demonstration programs whereby we would try certain employment training programs or whatever programs might promise to improve the situation regarding unemployment among Puerto Rican youth. We would have "control barrios" in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs.

The present study is not limited simply to a survey. We will also use what we call resident interviewers, people who will be sent to the "barrios" to live with a Puerto Rican family for a period of one month or more, and who will be collecting about 50 interviews each. Because of their extended period of residence, we expect essentially no non-response. This is one of the advantages of this particular method, and a principal reason why we are interested in using

it. We will also collect a great deal of information through observation, documentary records available within the community, the use of group interviews, intensive family interviews, and so forth.

The SIE analysis is now nearing completion and the writing is in process. We anticipate publishing a monograph on these results within the next few months. We do have some highlights, of which I will mention just a couple. First, as is the case with other data sources, there is just a horrible picture of the extent of Puerto Rican unemployment.

In addition, there has been a very strong growth in the proportion of female-headed families. This fact became clear when the 1960 census was compared with 1970 and then with the SIE in 1976. The latest figures from the SIE are that 43% of Puerto Rican families were headed by females; by this year, perhaps, it has exceeded 50%.

Another finding that we have come up with on a preliminary basis is that there has been a strong growth of unrelated youth within families that is, young people who apparently come in as boarders or for some other reason. I am not referring to what might be called "modern families" with unrelated people living together, or cohabiting. I am referring just to young people who are floating somehow and not related by blood to members of the family but are living with them. This is a puzzling phenomenon which we are still studying.

As far as our new survey is concerned, we are now in the process of doing scouting, locating exactly where the Puerto Ricans live. The listing and screening is to begin very shortly. The questionnaire is in first draft now, and the pre-test, in fact, is supposed to start tomorrow. The final interviews should start in March. To conclude, the analysis of the data for the survey that we are conducting and the writing of the survey monograph should be completed by the end of this year. This should include recommendations for dealing with the terrible problem of unemployment among Puerto Ricans.

RESEARCH

A SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE OF HISPANIC-AMERICAN MALE WORKERS:
PERSPECTIVES ON LABOR UTILIZATION AND EARNINGS

Marta Tienda*

Introduction

My basic charge is to provide a general outline of the social and economic characteristics of Hispanic workers. Because this task is extremely broad, it is necessary to limit the subject matter and to specify clearly the population groups that will be examined. This descriptive overview of the employment patterns and earnings differentials among Spanish origin male workers is intended to be preliminary and general.¹ Exclusion of women, although lamentable, is justified to permit a more in-depth exploration of the male labor force. But more importantly, women were excluded to avoid unjustified generalizations to women based on the experiences of male workers. In short, the state-of-the-art concerning the employment experiences of Hispanic origin women is sufficiently poor to warrant a special consideration of female workers in another paper. Therefore, a parallel analysis of Hispanic American female workers will be prepared in the near future.

A second issue that deserves comment before proceeding with the substance of this overview of the labor utilization and earnings patterns of male workers concerns the label, "Hispanic." This term is a generic one used to refer to persons variously identified as being of Spanish origin, Spanish-American descent, Spanish surname, Spanish heritage, Spanish language, etc. I have nothing to say about Hispanic male workers as a group. Thus, the title of my presentation is slightly misleading. My own position is that it is usually

*Dr. Marta Tienda is Assistant Professor in the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin at Madison. Assistance was provided by Lisa J. Neidert, Project Specialist, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Research support was provided by a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor (No. 21-55-79-27) and the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. Computational support was supported by a grant to the Center for Demography and Ecology from the Center of Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD-05876).

¹All tabulations are from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education.

inappropriate to generalize about "the Hispanic population" as if it were a monolithic entity. This is because the rich lines of variance are as important as any underlying commonalities of language and heritage. Given the great diversity among the Spanish origin groups, any contribution to our understanding of their social experiences must be specific to the various national origin groups comprising the total. I wish to illustrate this point by discussing the pattern of labor utilization and earnings differentials of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central/South American, and other Spanish origin workers.

The significance of differences in the employment patterns and socioeconomic attainments of individual workers can be better appreciated when viewed in the familial context. This context is important because demographic characteristics, such as family size and type of headship, directly affect the patterns of labor supply and the well-being of individual workers. In other words, families with no members in the labor force are likely to be the most genuine hardship cases. This situation is less likely among multiple-earner units where even if one or more members earns poverty wages, the collective earnings of all workers may enable the family to insulate itself from poverty. The following section is devoted to briefly comparing Hispanic origin families in terms of selected socioeconomic and demographic characteristics. Patterns of labor utilization, earnings, educational and occupational attainments of Hispanic workers are compared and discussed in subsequent sections.

The Familial Context of Work

Table 1 shows the extent of variation in family size, labor supply, headship, and income adequacy among Spanish origin families. Nativity and nationality designations refer to the head of the household and not necessarily to all family members. With the exception of Mexican origin families, those families with foreign born heads are slightly larger than their native-born counterparts. Whereas the modal family size for households headed by foreign born individuals is between three to five persons, the corresponding size for native born heads is one to two persons. Other Spanish origin households differ in that their lower modal size (one to two persons) corresponds to both native and foreign born groups. Among households headed by individuals of Mexican origin, the modal size is three to five persons for both the native and foreign born, but households in this size range are somewhat more prevalent among the native born.

Variation in the prevalence of very large families (six or more members) is also noteworthy. For the Central/South American and other Spanish nationalities, households containing six or more members are more prevalent among the native born as compared to the foreign born. Mexican origin workers are more likely to live in large families (nearly one in five contains at least six members). This affects the total work effort possible at the familial level.

Approximately one in ten of all Mexican origin families has three or more members in the labor force. Slightly more than 40 percent of native born and 34 percent of the Mexican families, have between two and three earning members. Between 13 and 16 percent, respectively, of the native and foreign born Mexican origin families have no members in the labor force. In light of the prevalence of multiple-earner households, it is rather striking that one-fourth of the foreign born and one-fifth of the native born Mexican origin families have incomes below the official poverty threshold. An additional 8 to 12 percent are classified as "near poor" families because the combined income of all workers is less than 125 percent of the poverty threshold (see Table 1).

Single earner families are the modal type among all groups except foreign born Puerto Ricans and native born Cubans. The prevalence of single earner households is due partly to the large proportion of husband-wife families in which the wife is not in the paid labor force. This proportion ranges from 27 percent for the foreign born Central/South American families to 40 percent of the native born Central/South Americans. Another contributing factor is the prevalence of female-headed households, which is highest among the Puerto Rican households, followed by foreign born Central/South American and native born other Spanish units, respectively. Puerto Rican households, whose head was not born on the mainland, are economically disadvantaged in that nearly two-fifths have no earners. Not surprisingly, the incidence of poverty is greatest for this group. Of the native and foreign born Puerto Ricans, 22 and 33 percent, respectively, have family incomes below the poverty threshold; and an additional 5 to 15 percent are classified as "near poor".

Cubans, Central/South Americans and other Spanish workers are less likely to be in poverty than either Mexicans or Puerto Ricans. Nevertheless, nearly one-fifth of all foreign born Cuban families have income below the poverty level. At the opposite extreme, about 70 percent of all foreign born Cuban families have family incomes 1-1/2 times the poverty level. Sullivan and Pedraza (1979) attribute the "bi-modal" distribution of family income among foreign born Cubans in terms of the relatively higher social origins of "political" immigrants, compared to "economic" immigrants, (those who immigrated for economic reasons). However, the following pages illustrate that, labor market outcomes are shaped by factors other than the human capital of individual workers. That is, income adequacy depends on the mode in which workers are inserted into the industry and employment structure as well as their socio-demographic characteristics. An examination of differences in the utilization of Hispanic origin workers well illustrates this point.

Labor Utilization

Labor force analysts regularly undertake studies of labor force participation to examine various dimensions and correlates of labor

supply. Many studies are concerned with documenting sources of variation in patterns and levels of participation among various socio-demographic groups, but until relatively recently, disaggregated analyses about the Hispanic origin groups were not available. Unemployment has received special attention among those concerned with the persistence of poverty among some segments of the population. Thus this item continues to rank high on research and policy agendas. Although much criticized, unemployment is still one of the key indicators of market conditions. At the individual level, it has been associated with economic hardship; but consensus on this point is far from complete, largely because of the importance of the familial context of work in determining economic well-being of persons. Also, the poverty literature is clear about the fact that the majority of the poor are working full time (Schiller, 1973).

If unemployment is controversial regarding what it does and does not represent, underemployment is even more controversial in this regard (Sullivan, 1978). A good deal of the controversy centers both on its conceptualization in terms of what dimensions should be represented in the notion of underemployment and on its operationalization in terms of how to measure each of the aspects deemed appropriate. Readers are referred to Sullivan's book (1978), Marginal Workers, Marginal Jobs, for a discussion of this debate. For the present purposes, we adopt Sullivan's labor utilization framework, which is adequate for illustrating differences in the pattern of utilization of Hispanic origin workers.

Underutilization is a collective term for unemployment and inadequate employment. The latter includes individuals who work fewer hours than desired (individuals involuntarily employed part time) and individuals who, although working full time, earned poverty wages. These three forms of underutilization--unemployment, underemployment by hours, and underemployment by income--represent distinct priorities on manpower agendas. Thus, Sullivan's framework has practical policy implications. The adequately employed are derived in a residual fashion as the share of the labor force not underutilized.

Table 2 summarizes the classification of five Hispanic National Origin groups according to the more conventional labor force categories and those of labor utilization framework. Two noteworthy messages emerge from these data. First, consistent with published data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census Bureau, Puerto Ricans have the highest unemployment rates of all the Hispanic groups, followed by Cuban and then Mexican origin men. The unemployment rate for men of Central/South American origin is quite low, and this is consistent with existing evidence concerning the relatively higher socioeconomic background of this group vis-à-vis Mexican and Puerto Rican populations. Second, Mexican workers have the highest underutilization rates; nearly 28 percent are either underemployed or

unemployed. They are followed closely by Puerto Ricans and Cubans, of whom nearly one-fourth are underutilized² (see Table 2).

Clearly, little is gained by dividing the labor force into the adequately and inadequately utilized as compared to employed and unemployed. However, the more differentiated classification of underutilization does better illustrate important differences in the sources of underutilization among the national origin groups. The information provided in Table 3 indicates that inadequate income is the most important component of underutilization among all Spanish-speaking groups, but its order of magnitude differs notably. For example, underemployment by income is twice as important as unemployment as a source of underutilization among Chicanos. Underemployment by income is slightly more important than unemployment as a form of underutilization among Cubans and Puerto Ricans; for Mexicans, this margin is even greater. The comparative lower level of unemployment among Central/South American workers is partly offset by higher unemployment by hours (see Table 3).

Underutilization is not unique to Hispanic workers, although its magnitude, composition and characteristics forms differ notably among the various Spanish-speaking groups. Describing the aggregated differences in labor utilization patterns is not very telling about the underlying sources of variation nor about the socioeconomic significance of various forms of underutilization. Therefore, the remainder of this paper examines the meaning of the employment patterns described above and worker earnings in terms of their relationship to selected socio-demographic and economic characteristics of workers. The data presented are largely descriptive, but geared toward illustrating how ascribed and achieved worker characteristics are related to employment and earnings patterns. Another goal is to highlight the importance of market characteristics to the employment and earnings of Spanish origin workers.

²At this point, a word about the other Spanish group is in order. Essentially this is a residual group which is quite heterogeneous. We suspect that many Hispanos and Chicanos are classified in this category because a disproportionate share resides in New Mexico or Arizona. However, this clue does not justify assuming that these individuals are Chicanos. In fact, the other Spanish group differs in a number of important respects from the Mexican origin population, including their metropolitan status, regional dispersion, and socioeconomic composition. The differences between the Central/South Americans and the other Spanish were also sufficiently great to warrant keeping them separate. To combine these national origin groups without any solid reason would have only confounded interpretation. Comparatively lower level of unemployment among Central/South American workers is partly offset by higher underemployment by hours.

Correlates of Underutilization and Earnings
Differentials among Hispanic Male Workers

The literature on labor force participation documented quite well the importance of ascriptive characteristics such as race, sex, ethnicity, and age for determining employment patterns and economic rewards. More recently, several scholars have emphasized the significance of market characteristics for shaping individual worker outcomes (Hodson, 1978; Beck, *et al.*, 1978; Parcel, 1979), but neither market characteristics nor workers' achieved and ascribed characteristics alone are sufficient to account for variation in the magnitude of status inequality and underutilization. Both must be considered. Describing aggregated differences in adequate and inadequate utilization patterns among Hispanic male workers (see Table 3) does not reveal the underlying sources of variation or the associated earnings levels. Therefore, it is necessary to disaggregate these results and to illustrate key dimensions of the underlying differentiation. One obvious question which suggests itself is whether the underutilizations are generally less preferred workers based on either ascribed or achieved characteristics. Another important concern is whether and how much a worker's level of utilization and earnings is constrained by structural factors, including both job characteristics and market conditions. In other words, are underutilized workers and low earners more likely to hold low-skill, low-pay jobs, or live in regions where wage and employment structures preclude the attainment of high pay, high status jobs.

The following section provides a descriptive profile of earnings and employment patterns of Hispanic male workers. The basic goal is to show how differences in group composition shape different labor market outcomes in terms of achieved and ascribed characteristics, regional distribution, and occupation/industry allocation. A multivariate analysis assesses the relative importance of individual versus structural characteristics in determining the likelihood that workers will be adequately employed. In keeping with our general premise about the importance of variation among Hispanic origin men, all analyses are conducted separately for each of the five national origin groups.

1. Individually Ascribed Characteristics.

Among Spanish origin workers, foreign birth is often associated with low status because immigrants, and especially those with low social origins, frequently encounter difficulties in making the transition to a new institutional setting in the course of a single lifetime. This is especially true for those who emigrate as adults. Implicit in the notion of immigrant economic integration is the idea that workers' skills do not always directly transfer from one setting to another. Thus, at least for the short run, workers may not be able to obtain jobs commensurate with their formal skills and training.

Two hypotheses are suggested by this line of reasoning:

- (1a) Foreign born workers are more likely to be underutilized than native born workers; and,
- (1b) Foreign born workers have lower earnings than their native born counterparts.

The data in Tables 4 and 5 address these statements. Nativity is significantly related to the pattern of labor underutilization for Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban workers, but not for Central/South American or other Spanish workers. Hypothesis (1a) is supported only for the Mexican origin workers. It is noteworthy that the five groups differ considerably in their immigrant composition because this helps explain the results. Whereas Central/South American and Cuban male workers are almost exclusively foreign born, about three-fourths of the other Spanish group is native born. There are over two times as many native as foreign born Mexican origin workers, but nearly three out of every four Puerto Rican males in the labor force were born on the island as compared to the mainland (see Table 4).

For Cubans, the relationship between utilization and nativity shows a clear and interesting reversal of what was originally hypothesized. That is, the foreign born are apparently less likely to be underutilized than the native born. There are at least two reasons why this finding is plausible for Cubans. First, the age composition of this group is quite different for the foreign and native born. Specifically, the native born generation is, for the most part, very young compared to the foreign born (see Table A-1).³ Also, foreign born Cubans, at least the cohorts that emigrated during the 1960s, were largely comprised of upper to middle-class workers. Although many professionals had to invest in more training to "validate" their credentials, many actually had done so by 1976. Thus, there may have been more underutilization of Cuban workers during the period immediately following their entry to the U.S. Given these unique aspects of the Cuban work force, it would be interesting to determine whether and to what extent Cubans may be holding jobs for which they are over qualified. If this practice is prevalent, then the extent of underutilization of Cuban workers may be understated.

With respect to Mexican and Puerto Rican workers, the pattern of underutilization by type is as important as the finding that the

³As shown in Table A-1 of the Appendix, the very young and very old Cubans are considerably less likely to be underutilized, but they are so few in number that these relationships are not statistically reliable. Prime-age Cuban workers are much less likely to be adequately utilized than their Central/South American and other Spanish counterparts.

original hypothesis (1a) was only upheld for Mexican workers. Among both foreign and native born Mexican workers, underemployment by income is the most significant contributor to overall underutilization, but the magnitude of this factor is about two times greater among the foreign born.

In the main, the pattern of earnings differentials among native and foreign born Hispanic males parallels the findings observed for labor utilization patterns. An exception is that hypothesis (1b) also holds for Central/South Americans. Among Mexican origin men, the native born have a \$1,400 earnings advantage over their foreign born counterparts. Native born Central/South Americans enjoy a \$3,300 advantage over the foreign born. For the remaining three groups, the earnings advantage is for the foreign born, contrary to expectation. This ranges from approximately \$1,675 for Puerto Ricans to \$350 for other Spanish males (see Table 5).

To a large extent these differentials can be explained in terms of the occupational distribution of the nativity and national origin groups. For example, Mexican origin workers are notably more concentrated in agricultural occupations, but this is particularly true of the foreign born. Whereas between 6 and 14 percent of the native and foreign born Mexican male workers are employed as farm laborers and supervisors, less than three percent of the foreign born workers of non-Mexican origin are so employed. For the latter, the proportion employed as farm laborers and supervisors is even less. Alternatively, Mexican origin workers are relatively more underrepresented among the professional and managerial occupational positions than any of the other Hispanic origin groups, and these differences are particularly salient among the foreign born (see Table A-2).

To summarize, the evidence does not provide any clear support for the premise that the foreign born are the most disadvantaged workers in terms of earnings underutilization. Our results suggest that nativity is not totally irrelevant for determining workers' employment and earnings patterns, but that its importance may operate via the allocation of workers to jobs. This, in turn, is partly determined by differences in achieved characteristics and market constraints, as demonstrated in the following sections. The data invite further exploration of the differences among workers and the jobs they hold because this analysis should help partly explain the apparent inconsistencies among the nationality and nativity groups.

2. Individually Achieved Characteristics.

Human capital theorists in economics and status attainment analysts in sociology emphasize the importance of education and vocational training in differentiating socioeconomically successful and unsuccessful workers. The status attainment perspective focuses upon education as representing the achievement of credentials used to allocate individuals to occupational positions while down playing the

investment properties of education stressed by human capital theorists (Boyd, 1979). Despite these semantic differences, both perspectives are similar in assuming undifferentiated labor markets. The achievement/investment perspective of education suggests the following relationships to labor utilization and earnings.

- (2a) Better educated workers are less likely to be underutilized than their less educated counterparts; and,
- (2b) Better educated workers have higher earnings than their less educated counterparts.

An additional achieved or "changeable" characteristic which is significant for the Hispanic population is language usage. Language is not only a concrete manifestation of cultural distinctiveness, but also the most basic human capital skill. Of course, its importance may differ from one job setting to another. Communication skills are less important for most agricultural activities or construction work, for example, than for sales or clerical jobs. Nevertheless, it is generally safe to argue that knowledge and use of English is a preferred and at times a necessary, albeit insufficient, condition for adequate employment and earnings.

Accordingly, an additional set of hypotheses is suggested:

- (3a) Workers whose primary language is Spanish are more likely to be underutilized than those whose primary language is English; and,
- (3b) Workers whose primary language is Spanish have lower earnings than English speaking counterparts.

Tables 6 and 7 provide information needed to evaluate the first set of hypotheses concerning the relationship between education and, respectively, utilization and earnings. Notice first how the groups differ in educational attainment levels. Over half of all Mexican and Puerto Rican male workers have not finished high school compared to two-fifths of the other Spanish male workers. More detailed information about schooling differences among the Hispanic origin groups is provided in Appendix Table A-3. This data shows that Cuban, Central/South American and other Spanish male workers have a median educational attainment level of 12 years compared to 10 years for the Mexican and Puerto Rican groups.

The proportion of Hispanic origin workers aged 25 or more with less than 6 years of schooling is striking, ranging from 43 percent of all foreign born Mexican workers to less than 3 percent of the native born Puerto Ricans. At the opposite extreme, the proportion of Hispanic origin male workers with college degrees varies notably among the groups, but college degrees are relatively scarce among the foreign born Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. Nearly one-fourth of the foreign born males of Central/South American origin have college degrees

compared to 16 and 13 percent, respectively, of Cubans and other Spanish males. On the other hand, less than 5 percent of the foreign born Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have college degrees, although an additional 6 to 8 percent have completed some college.

For all groups except Cubans, the relationship between education and utilization is statistically significant. As expected, workers who have completed high school are considerably less likely to be underutilized than high school dropouts.⁴ Nearly 89 percent of the other Spanish male workers with a high school degree or more are adequately utilized compared to 84 percent of the comparably educated Puerto Ricans, 83 percent of the Central/South Americans and 80 percent of the Cubans and Mexicans. For Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans, underutilization by income is three times more important among the high school dropouts as compared to high school graduates, but for the Central/South Americans and other Spanish males, underutilization by income is two times higher among those without high school degrees compared to those who finished secondary school. For Puerto Ricans, unemployment is the major source of underutilization for both categories of schooling for Mexican origin males. Unemployment is the largest contributor to underutilization only among the high school graduates. Underutilization by unemployment is more prevalent among Cubans and other Spanish origin males who failed to complete high school (see Table 6).

In interpreting the significance of the observed differentials, it is important to ponder the implications of immigrant composition of the national origin groups. There are two specific but related factors to be considered in this connection: (1) differences in years of schooling completed by native and foreign born workers; and (2) the comparability of schooling in the United States and in other countries. For example, lower shares of the Mexican and Puerto Rican foreign born males have completed education beyond high school compared to Cubans or Central/South Americans (see Table A-3). It is also possible that schooling abroad may be worth less on a year for year basis because, at least for the short run, a loss of human capital worth may occur. This issue cannot be examined here, but Barry Chiswick's (1978) work about the Americanization of foreign born males is suggestive in this regard.

⁴The crude dichotomy does not do justice to the within-group differences in educational attainment. I am not particularly fond of dichotomies, but in preparing the preliminary analyses, I found myself constrained by sample sizes, particularly for the Cuban and Central/South American samples. More detailed cross-tabulations produced unreliable results when the four category labor utilization scheme was used. A more refined breakdown can, however, be used with earnings breakdowns and multivariate techniques. Nevertheless, I believe the results are suggestive about the importance of schooling.

It is appropriate, however, to evaluate the economic worth of education among the groups by examining median earnings differentials associated with various schooling levels. This information, which is pertinent for addressing the second set of hypotheses in this section, is provided in Table 7. In support of our general statement, the data show a generally positive association between education and work earnings. It is clear, however, that the three schooling thresholds represented by completion of primary school, high school, and college are important determinants of earnings, above and beyond the returns to each year of school completed. Notice, for example, that in three out of five instances (Cubans and Central/South Americans are exceptions), individuals who have completed six years of school earn more than those who attained a degree. A similar relationship appears for the transition from high school to college, except for Puerto Ricans and other Spanish males, who deviate from the pattern (see Table 7).

It is not surprising that the lowest median earnings correspond to the groups with the lowest median educational levels, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. Clearly, the low earnings reflect differences in educational composition of these groups, but not completely. It is interesting, for example, to compare differences in median earnings among groups within levels of education. These comparisons highlight the extent to which earnings are determined by factors other than formal training credentials or human capital. At the low end of the educational spectrum, notice that Mexican origin males with less than six years of formal schooling earn approximately \$2,100 less than their comparably trained Puerto Rican workers and between \$1,800 to \$505 less than the other comparably trained Hispanic workers.

Focusing upon the college trained workers, it appears that Puerto Ricans reap the highest monetary rewards from college degrees, followed by other Spanish and Cuban workers. Alternatively, Mexican and Central/South American origin males with college degrees earn comparatively less than their Hispanic origin counterparts. There is no obvious reason why this should be the case, but it is not appropriate to speculate about the plausible explanations until other variables which may be correlated with educational attainment, such as language usage and age, are taken into account.

Some insight into the importance of language for labor utilization and earnings is provided in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. One clear message is that language is not synonymous with nativity. The results do support the statement that users of English as the primary language are more likely to be adequately employed. A statistically significant relationship exists between labor utilization for all groups except the Central/South Americans, but even this group borders on statistical significance ($P=.067$). The greatest differentials in adequately utilized workers according to primary language usage correspond to Cuban and Mexican origin men. Specifically, Cuban and Mexican origin males whose primary language is English are about 18 percent points more likely to be adequately utilized than their

Spanish-speaking counterparts. The differential for Puerto Rican workers is slightly lower, or about 14 percent. Other Spanish males who communicate mainly in Spanish are only about seven percentage points less likely to be underutilized than their counterparts who usually speak English. Presumably, individuals who consider Spanish to be their primary language are less proficient in English, but it is possible that some of the predominantly Spanish speakers are fully or partly bilingual as well. This possibility might explain the lower differentials for Central/South American and other Spanish males vis-à-vis those observed among the remaining three Hispanic origin groups (see Table 8).

There is an interesting and noteworthy pattern of relationship between the primary language used by workers and the type of underutilization among the five national origin groups. Mexicans, Central/South Americans, and other Spanish workers whose primary language is English are more likely to be underutilized by unemployment, whereas underemployment by level of income is the most important source of underutilization for those who primarily speak Spanish. Among Puerto Ricans and Cubans, unemployment is the largest single source of underutilization among both Spanish and English speakers, although underemployment by level of income is also a fairly substantial contributor to inadequate employment among the Spanish speakers. The salience of underutilization by level of income among the speakers of Spanish, which ranges from a high of 23 percent among Mexican origin males to 10 percent among Cuban origin males, hints at the importance of language as a labor allocation mechanism which relegates individuals with limited English ability to low paying jobs. This can be further appreciated by examining the earnings differentials according to language use for each of the national origin groups.

For every group, workers whose primary language is English earn significantly more than their counterparts who primarily speak Spanish, as hypothesized. On the average, individuals of Puerto Rican origin who speak predominantly English enjoy a \$960 earnings advantage over their Spanish-speaking counterparts for workers of other Spanish origin, the differential between English and Spanish speakers is four times greater, or approximately \$3,800. Men of Mexican, Cuban, and Central/South American origin fall somewhere between these two extremes with an average earnings differential ranging between \$2,000 to \$2,500 (see Table 9).

Individuals of Mexican and other Spanish origin whose primary language is designated as "other" represent a special group of English monolinguals who not only reported English to be their primary current language, but also were reared in homes where English was the primary language used. In a sense, these may be regarded as third and later generation persons who may be more assimilated, socially and culturally, than those whose current primary language is English, but who were reared in homes where some Spanish was spoken. In other words, these individuals comprise a special class of English monolinguals and

should be slightly more advantaged in terms of earnings ability than their English speaking counterparts who were reared in Spanish-speaking homes. There is support for this view among the Mexican origin male workers who enjoy a small (\$300) earnings advantage over their English speaking counterparts reared in homes where some Spanish was spoken, but this is not the case for the other Spanish workers.

The great heterogeneity of this group makes it difficult to speculate about the source of the observed difference, but one logical explanation is that these individuals are largely Hispanos, an especially disadvantaged group of Spanish and Mexican Americans who have been sheltered in rural enclaves over a number of years. Further work is required to substantiate this claim, and it is unlikely that the SIE data will ever permit an acid test.

To summarize, the tabulations based on workers' ascribed and achieved characteristics suggest that the latter are more significant for identifying less successful workers. That is, labor underutilization and earnings inequities among Hispanic origin workers can be partly attributed to differences in educational attainment and English proficiency, but the significance of foreign birth is less clear, at least for Hispanic workers of non-Mexican origin. In general, workers who have completed high school, are native born and speak predominately English are less likely to be underutilized and to have low earnings than their foreign born, Spanish-speaking and poorly educated counterparts. The latter characteristics correspond to less preferred or "marginal" workers. However, there were several inconsistencies in the pattern of relationship among the national origin groups. These inconsistencies suggest a need to examine the thesis that the employment and earnings of individual workers are also influenced by structural factors, including labor market and regional characteristics. The question arises as to the role of labor markets in differentiating and stratifying Hispanic origin workers. Accordingly, the following section explores patterns of variation in labor utilization and earnings inequality among Spanish origin workers according to two kinds of "structural" characteristics, namely labor market segmentation and regional market characteristics.

3. Structural Factors: Market Segmentation and Regional Concentration.

Assumptions of the human capital and status attainment perspectives of labor markets as unified and competitive systems have been challenged by arguments of economic dualism or market segmentation. While the specifics of the various arguments advanced in the course of the last decade or so differ in particulars (Hodson, 1978; Bibb and Form, 1977; Freedman, 1976), the common unifying theme is the thesis that important cleavages exist along occupational and industrial lines. These cleavages have significant implications for the opportunity structures and work experiences of individuals.

The criteria most often used to identify market segments include the characteristics of occupations, industries, or some combination of both. Focusing on the occupational dimension, proponents of segmented markets place emphasis on job stability and postulate two distinct labor markets--one with stable, well-paid jobs, and desirable working conditions and another with unstable, poorly paid jobs, and undesirable working conditions. A somewhat different perspective on the question of dual markets is illustrated in the work of Bibb and Form (1977), Hodson (1978), and Beck, *et al.* (1978). Rather than define market dualism on the basis of occupational sectors, they do so on the basis of industry sectors. Whether one chooses to label these as monopoly and competitive versus core and periphery segments, the important point is that the monopoly or core sector is characterized by high profits, capital intensity, and a high degree of unionization. This sector, therefore, affords workers access to career job ladders and better pay scales. The opposite conditions prevail in the competitive or periphery sector where wage structures and career ladders are more restricted to generally smaller firm sizes, labor intensive production operations and low levels of unionization. In summary, though the empirical bases for these two approaches to market structure are different, their theoretical underpinnings and implications for the utilization of workers are quite similar.

The general significance of the segmentation perspective for the socioeconomic characteristics of Hispanic male workers resides in the discriminatory mechanisms which results in the inferior wages of minorities in the labor force. In the words of Boyd (1979) "there is a differential evaluation of workers' human capital within labor market sectors depending on selected ascriptive characteristics." More specifically, labor allocation and sorting mechanisms relegate minorities, elderly, teens, and the poorly educated workers into the secondary market. Presumably, individual behavior reinforces the existing occupational allocation (Sullivan, 1978). Behavior, then, is used to explain or rationalize the existing market stratification. This tautological reasoning is bothersome because the coincidence of the least preferred workers in the least preferred jobs is used to explain the underutilization and low earnings of workers. It is important to maintain an analytical distinction between marginal workers and marginal jobs, but both are pertinent for understanding the labor market outcomes in terms of employment patterns and earnings.

Stated as working hypotheses, the market segmentation perspective suggests the following about the labor utilization and earnings of Hispanic origin workers:

- (4a) Workers employed in the primary or core sector are less likely to be underutilized than those employed in the secondary or periphery sector, and,

- (4b) Workers employed in the primary or core sector have higher earnings than those employed in the secondary or periphery sector.

The data in Tables 10 and 11 address the first hypothesis. A statistically significant association between utilization and occupational segments appears for only two out of five groups--Mexicans, and other Spanish workers, but the pattern of relationship is uniformly in the expected direction for these two groups. Specifically, Mexican and other Spanish origin males who are employed in the primary sector are, respectively, between 12 and 10 percent more likely to be adequately utilized than their counterparts employed in the secondary sector. Although the relative importance of each form of underutilization differs within groups, for both the Mexican and other Spanish groups, the magnitude of each form of underutilization is greater in the secondary sector. Also, the lack of job security for Mexican and other Spanish males who usually hold secondary jobs can be appreciated by noting unemployment is twice as great in the secondary sector as compared to the primary sector. There is some consistency in the relationship between the form of underutilization and sectoral allocation. That is, underemployment by level of income is the most important form of underutilization in both the primary and secondary market sectors, but its magnitude is between 1-1/2 to two times greater in the latter (see Table 10).

There is more mixed support for the market segmentation hypothesis in Table 11 which suggests that only Mexican and Central/South American males who hold periphery jobs are more likely to be underutilized than their counterparts employed in the core industries. For the remaining three groups, a statistically significant relationship between utilization and industry market sectors does not emerge. Mexican male workers employed in the core industries are about 10 percent more likely to be adequately utilized as compared to their counterparts employed in periphery industries; for the Central/South American workers, the differential between the proportion of adequately employed workers in the core and periphery industries is slightly higher, or about 14 percent. Again, underemployment by income is the largest contributor to inadequate utilization of these two groups in both market sectors, but more so in the periphery industries. One unexpected finding is that for the other Spanish, Cuban, and Puerto Rican workers employed in the core sector, unemployment is about equally as important as a source of underutilization as underemployment by level of income. The reasons for this outcome are not obvious, but it is possible that worker discouragement operates to keep measured levels of unemployment in the periphery sector lower than it actually is (see Table 11).

In spite of the mixed support for hypothesis (4a) concerning the relationship between labor utilization and market structure, it is shaping all labor market outcomes. Evidence about the significance of market sectors for earnings differentials among Hispanic

origin workers is rather impressive and quite consistent with previous studies which have examined income differentials among Black and White workers employed in core and periphery markets (Hodson, 1978; Beck, *et al.*, 1978). As shown in Tables 12 and 13, for all Hispanic origin groups, workers employed in the primary or core sectors have a solid earnings advantage over those employed in the secondary or periphery sectors. The magnitude of median earnings differentials among the groups are as striking as the consistency in the pattern of relationship. Focusing on occupational sectors, notice that men of Mexican and other Spanish origin employed in the primary sector have a \$4,000 or more earnings advantage over their counterparts employed in secondary occupations. For the remaining three groups, the earnings differential between core and periphery workers is considerably less, but quite substantial, ranging from \$2,300 for Cubans to \$2,600 for Puerto Ricans (see Table 12).

Differentials delineated along industrial segments, while somewhat lower than those observed between occupation groups, are nonetheless substantial. Again, the greatest earnings discrepancy corresponds to men of Mexican and other Spanish origin. Those holding periphery jobs earn between \$3,300 and \$3,600 less than those working in core industries. Cubans, Central/South Americans and Puerto Ricans employed in the core sector make between \$3,000 and \$1,500 more than their counterparts engaged in the periphery sector. In brief, the relationship between market sectors and earnings differentials is significant for Hispanic origin workers. But there is an obvious and pressing need to examine further the extent to which the within-sector differentials can be explained by worker characteristics as compared to other "structural" characteristics which transcend the bound of the dualistic nature of the market itself (see Table 13).

Of course, these results are more suggestive than they are conclusive about the importance of market segmentation for determining employment and income level among Hispanic groups. One of the greatest limitations is that the market segments are too coarsely specified. Even though this dichotomous operationalization is frequently used, few would deny that the heterogeneity within sectors is likely to be great. Also, in refining the market segments, there is a pressing need to resolve the question about the relationship between industrially and occupationally delineated sectors. Marsha Freedman's (1976) work is most suggestive in this regard, but unfortunately our small samples prohibit the use of a more refined framework, at least not for the purposes of multiple cross-tabulations.

There is one further element that warrants consideration in a discussion about how structural factors shape the employment and earnings patterns of Hispanic origin workers. For lack of a better term, I call these labor market "conditions", and conceptually distinguish them from market segmentation which reflects the "nature" of the labor market itself. This distinction is partly semantic, but not completely. There are numerous dimensions to be considered within the

general rubric of market conditions, and it is easy to plan an entire research agenda around this subject.⁵

For the present, and in light of time and space constraints, I can only provide an illustrative analysis using geographic region as a crude proxy for market conditions. This is not totally inappropriate because of the unique importance of regional distribution for the Hispanic population and because of well documented regional differences in wage and employment structures. My expectation is that underutilization will be greatest in areas where members of a minority group are most concentrated. There is a body of literature which supports this line of reasoning with respect inequality, but no researchers have attempted to relate size of minority populations to the pattern of labor utilization.

Stated in hypothesis form, this implies that:

- (5a) Workers residing in areas where members of their own minority group are concentrated are more likely to be underutilized than those who reside in areas where their group is less concentrated; and
- (5b) Workers residing in areas where members of their own minority group are concentrated have lower earnings than those who reside in areas where their group is not concentrated.

The results in Table 14 which show the relationship between region and labor utilization are in some ways more revealing than those based on market segments. That is, although the results are statistically significant for only Mexican, Cuban, and other Spanish origin males, they are in the expected direction. Specifically, Mexican origin workers are between 13 and 9 percent more likely to be adequately employed if they reside in the North Central region versus the South or West. This, of course, captures effects of both regional wage differentials and minority concentration. Similarly, Cubans are more likely to be underutilized in the South, where the majority reside. For the other Spanish workers, the significance of regional distribution is less clear because this groups is, relative to the other Hispanic origin groups, less regionally concentrated. Yet, nearly 49 percent of this group resides in the five Southwestern

⁵I am currently examining the ways in which various market characteristics, such as the prevalence of high wage industries, the extent of industry and occupational differentiation, the extent of minority concentration, and the like, shape the occupational attainment and income determination processes for the various Hispanic origin groups. This work is in a very preliminary phase and cannot be reported here to income inequality, but no researchers have attempted to relate the relative size of minority populations to the pattern of labor utilization.

states of California, New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, and Arizona (see Table 14).

The greater underutilization of other Spanish workers residing in the Northeast is due largely to unemployment whereas in the North Central, West and South regions, underemployment by level of income is a relatively more important source of underutilization. It is curious that this should be the case for the North Central region because among Mexican origin workers, the reverse pattern holds. One might expect that in the industrial North Central region, wage opportunities--if not always high prestige occupational opportunities--are more plentiful and, thus, workers of Spanish origin should have greater access to better wages. One possible explanation for the unexpected results resides in the geographic distribution of the Spanish origin population by rural/urban or metro/non-metro residence, for this certainly influences intra-region wage differentials. Further analyses are needed to explore these possibilities further.

In light of the prevalence of underemployment by level of income among Mexican and other Spanish origin workers who reside in the South and West, it is not surprising that median earnings are substantially lower for these individuals. Notice in Table 15 that Mexican origin workers residing in the South earn about \$440 less than the average of all workers, and about \$1,900 less than their counterparts residing in the North Central region. In comparison, men of other Spanish origin who reside in the North Central region fare better than Mexican origin workers. The average earnings advantage of the former is almost \$2,500 above that for Mexican origin men residing in the North Central Region. But the reasons for this disparity are not immediately apparent, except that men of other Spanish origin have better education and are more linguistically assimilated.

Puerto Rican workers are more disadvantaged earnings-wise in the Northeast, where the vast majority reside, in comparison to those living in the North Central and Southern regions. Although Puerto Rican earnings are slightly lower in the West compared to the Northeast, relatively few Puerto Ricans reside in this region, hence the reliability of the estimates may be low. Earnings of Cuban male workers are, as predicted, also lowest in the geographic region where the majority are concentrated. Cuban workers fare much better in the Northeast, probably due to their higher educational attainment and better occupational positions vis-à-vis the Puerto Ricans (see Table 15).

In brief, there is some evidence to support the claim that Hispanic origin males are more disadvantaged in terms of earnings if they reside and work in regions where members of their own national origin group are concentrated. This pattern is even evident for workers of Central/South American and other Spanish origin, although the results for these groups must be interpreted with greater caution because, overall, both are relatively less concentrated geographically than

Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. While these results are more suggestive than conclusive, it is apparent that further investigation about the structural correlates of the employment and earnings of Hispanic workers is needed.

What is unclear, however, is whether structural factors are significant in shaping labor market outcomes above and beyond individually achieved and ascribed characteristics. Before closing, therefore, it is instructive to explore this possibility. From a policy standpoint, the value of establishing the relative importance of person and place characteristics on employment patterns is that programs and policies designed to improve the socioeconomic attainments of workers would differ considerably in scope and content from those aimed at reducing market discrimination, regional wage inequities, and sectoral dualism.

The Worker versus the Workplace: A Preliminary Assessment

To provide a sense for the relative importance of worker and work place characteristics on labor market outcomes, only employment adequacy is assessed.⁶ For this analysis, workers were dichotomized into two groups representing the adequately and inadequately utilized. Then probability of being adequately utilized was predicted using Multiple Classification Analysis. This statistical technique is appropriate for dichotomous dependent variables and lends itself to a clear and straightforward interpretation. The effects of each of the independent variables are expressed as deviations from the grand mean (in this instance, the proportion of adequately utilized workers) and the relative importance of each variable is indicated by the eta and beta statistics. These results are reported in Table 16.

Perhaps the most general message from these results is that the relationship among employment, labor market, and worker characteristics is extremely complex. For all groups except Central/South Americans, a statistically significant model is estimated, but the relative importance of sociodemographic and labor market characteristics differ considerably among the national origin groups. Whereas all but one of the variables included in the equations were significantly related to the probability that a Mexican origin worker would be adequately employed, none of the variables emerged as significant predictors of the utilization status of males of Central/South American origin. Therefore, results for the latter group will not be discussed further (see Table 16).

In light of the extensive discussion that preceded, it is appropriate to focus attention primarily on the relative importance of

⁶This was done partly in the interest of space constraints but mostly to avoid a more complex and lengthy discussion that would be necessary to specify earnings determination function.

individual and structural characteristics in predicting workers' labor utilization status. Notice that for Mexican origin workers, achieved characteristics are relatively more important than market characteristics or geographic region in determining employment adequacy, but it appears that language usage exerts a slightly stronger effect than education (beta of 1.8 and .15, respectively). Both the unadjusted and adjusted effects of education and language are in the expected direction. Although the magnitude of the net effects is lessened because of the intercorrelation among the independent variables, education effects appear to be attenuated more than those of language. Nativity effects are eliminated altogether, once language and education are accounted for. For Mexicans, sectoral allocation and region of residence are both significant predictors of employment adequacy, but regional concentration appears to be almost twice as important as market structure. In fact, the relative importance of region increased rather than decreased once the effects of other variables was netted out, whereas the influence of market sectors decreased by almost two-thirds.

Puerto Ricans differ from Mexican workers in that nativity is the only worker characteristic which emerges as a significant predictor of adequate labor utilization. Native born Puerto Rican workers are about 12 percent less likely to be adequately utilized compared to their foreign born counterparts, perhaps suggesting the importance of migrant selectivity in molding the flow of workers from Puerto Rico to the mainland. Although none of the other characteristics exerts significant influences on worker utilization status, it is noteworthy that regional concentration is considerably more important than either achieved characteristics, such as education and language usage, or labor market sectors. With a statistical significance slightly below the more conventional 95 percent level, further interpretation of the net deviations is not desirable.

Correlates of the probability that Cuban workers will be adequately utilized differ from those observed for Mexican and Puerto Ricans in a number of important respects. A first noteworthy difference is that both nativity and language usage exert significant effects on workers' employment adequacy. For Mexican workers, only language was statistically significant whereas for Puerto Ricans, nativity emerged as the more important variable. Among Cubans, language is slightly more important than nativity, as indicated by the partial betas, but nativity differences net of region, education, language, and market sector effects are greater than those between language groups. Specifically, native born Cubans are about 43 percent less likely to be adequately utilized than their foreign born counterparts. In contrast, Cubans who primarily speak Spanish are about 21 percent more likely to be inadequately utilized than those whose primary language is English.

Sectoral allocation plays an important role in shaping labor utilization patterns of Cuban workers. However, there is a curious

reversal of the pattern of relationship between sectoral allocation and utilization among Cubans. That is, individuals employed in the secondary occupations within the peripheral sector, who presumably should be doubly handicapped in their prospects for adequate employment, are almost 25 percent more likely to be adequately utilized than their counterparts holding primary occupations within the core sector. There is no obvious explanation for this finding, but it may reflect the influence of regional enclave economies which may offer special advantages to ethnic workers. This possibility requires further in-depth scrutiny based on special surveys of employers and firms owned and operated by Cubans.

Finally, for other Spanish workers, it appears that the education exerts the most dominant effect on the probability that workers will be adequately utilized. As observed for Cubans, both language usage and nativity exert independent effects on worker utilization status, but the former is barely significant. These findings, as well as those observed for other groups, indicate that language usage and nativity are not completely coterminous, but rather tap different dimensions of ethnic group membership. Although the pattern of relationship between nativity and labor utilization is similar to that observed for Cubans and Puerto Ricans, the magnitude of the differential between the native and foreign born is considerably less among other Spanish males. Another noteworthy difference for this group is the finding that both market sectors and region exert important influences on workers' employment adequacy, but the effect of region is stronger and more statistically significant than that corresponding to market sectors. Again, this reinforces the claim that region and market sectors tap conceptually different dimensions of the broad concept of a labor market. Certainly these results are inviting for further exploration along similar lines, provided that more refined indicators of market structure and composition are used.

It is obvious, in closing, that these tentative results raise as many questions as they answer, and therefore, it is essential to direct further research toward the goal of clarifying and explaining the observed inconsistencies and similarities among the groups. The task of rendering intelligible the differential socioeconomic success and employment patterns of Hispanic origin workers will no doubt be difficult. That is due not only to the great diversity among the groups with respect to their individual characteristics, but also the great variation between groups in the patterns of relationship between labor market outcomes and individual or market characteristics.

In this highly descriptive overview, the great complexity was highlighted by examining the importance of selected achieved, ascribed and structural characteristics on the utilization patterns and earnings of Hispanic male workers. There are certainly many more pertinent variables which could not be considered here. Further analysts attempting to characterize the Hispanic workforce must be mindful of

the importance of demographic characteristics, including family composition and family labor supply patterns, as well as the patterns of underutilization that result in low socioeconomic returns. Also, the rich lines of variance among the national origin groups must be consistently made explicit, for, as demonstrated in this profile, country of origin is an important aspect of the social and economic stratification of the Hispanic work force.

References

- Beck, E. M., Patrick Horan and Charles M. Tolbert II
1978 "Labour market segmentation and discrimination against minorities." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.
- Bibb, Robert and William H. Form
1977 "The effects of industrial, occupational, and sex stratification on wages in blue-collar markets." Social Forces 55 (June): 974-996.
- Boyd, Monica
1979 "Immigrants, income attainments and labour markets in Canada." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Chiswick, Barry
1978 "The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men." Journal of Political Economy 86 (No. 5): 897-921.
- Duncan, Otis D.
1961 "A socioeconomic index for all occupations." Pp. 109-138 in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. (ed.) Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press.
- Freedman, M.
1976 Labor Markets: Segments and Shelters. Montclair, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmum and Co.
- Hodson, R.
1978 "Labor in the Monopoly, Competitive and State Sectors of Production." Working Paper 78-2, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Montagna, Paul B.
1979 "Labor market segmentation." Paper presented at the Didactic Seminar, American Sociological Association, August, 1979.
- Parcel, Toby L.
1979 "Regional labor markets and earnings." American Sociological Review 44 (April): 262-279.
- Schiller, Bradley R.
1976 The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Sullivan, Teresa A.

1978 Marginal Workers, Marginal Jobs: The Underutilization of American Workers. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Sullivan, Teresa A. and Silvia Pedraza-Bailey

1979 "Differential success among Cuban-American and Mexican-American immigrants: The role of policy and community." Report prepared for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under Research and Development Grant No. 21-17-78-03.

TABLE 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISPANIC FAMILIES BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY
(in percent)

Characteristics	National Origin									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Ctrl./S. American		Other Spanish	
	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign
Family Size										
1-2	31.7	38.0	53.7	37.5	62.0	41.5	59.9	36.9	51.2	49.9
3-5	50.7	42.0	39.1	50.0	37.1	51.2	26.4	57.7	38.7	40.7
6+	17.7	20.0	7.1	12.5	1.0	7.4	13.7	5.4	10.1	9.4
Family Members in Labor Force										
0	12.9	16.4	16.9	40.0	5.9	12.6	0.0	8.9	21.1	22.8
1	45.8	48.3	57.5	34.2	4.9	38.7	64.7	48.9	46.1	40.7
2	30.3	24.9	22.3	20.4	88.2	35.5	8.7	37.2	25.5	31.1
3 or more	11.0	10.4	3.3	5.5	1.0	13.1	26.6	5.9	7.3	5.4
Earners in Family										
0	11.1	15.2	13.6	38.2	5.9	14.3	0.0	8.1	17.3	20.7
1	42.3	47.7	56.3	35.4	4.9	41.4	52.6	46.4	46.0	39.4
2-3	41.1	33.9	30.1	25.7	89.2	40.4	33.7	44.6	34.4	38.8
4 or more	5.5	3.2	0.0	0.8	0.0	3.9	13.7	0.9	2.3	1.1
Sex, Marital Status, & Employment of wife										
Male head, MSP*, wife in paid labor force	30.0	23.7	21.4	18.1	52.1	38.8	17.5	33.6	23.7	35.1
Male head, MSP, wife not in paid labor force	38.5	40.3	29.8	33.9	37.1	31.1	43.2	27.3	36.5	30.0
Other male head	11.7	17.2	18.9	8.9	4.9	9.6	25.6	11.6	13.6	13.2
Female head	19.8	18.7	29.9	39.1	5.9	20.5	13.7	27.5	26.2	21.7
Family Income to Poverty Level										
Below poverty	21.4	25.5	21.6	32.8	5.9	19.7	0.0	14.8	15.3	15.7
100-124% poverty level	8.3	12.4	5.4	14.7	1.0	4.9	5.1	7.8	7.5	3.1
125-149% poverty level	7.9	10.9	5.1	6.4	0.0	5.7	11.4	6.7	3.5	5.5
150% above poverty level	62.4	51.2	67.8	46.1	93.1	69.6	83.4	70.7	73.8	75.7

*Married, spouse present

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF THE LABOR FORCE AND LABOR UTILIZATION
APPROACH TO EMPLOYMENT: MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY NATIONAL ORIGIN
(in percent)

Labor Categories by Approach	National Origin				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Labor Force					
Employed	92.8	89.2	90.9	97.1	94.0
Unemployed	9.0	14.2	12.5	5.1	6.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Labor Utilization					
Adequately	72.4	75.1	76.4	81.6	84.1
Inadequately	27.6	24.9	23.6	18.4	15.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3
 DISTRIBUTION OF HISPANIC MALE WORKERS BY TYPE OF
 UTILIZATION AND NATIONAL ORIGIN
 (in percent)

Utilization Categories and Sex	National Origin				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Adequately Employed	72.4	75.1	76.4	81.6	84.1
Unemployed	9.0	14.2	12.3	5.1	6.9
Underutilized by Hours	5.0	1.6	3.5	5.1	1.9
Underutilized by Income	13.6	9.1	7.6	7.9	7.1
Total Percent (N)	100.0 (2231)	99.9 (364)	100.0 (209)	100.1 (206)	100.0 (692)

TABLE 4

UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY NATIVITY AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		American		Central/South Other Spanish	
	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign
Adequately Employed	75.9	64.9	74.7	75.2	62.0	77.1	76.2	81.9	82.8	87.6
Unemployed	8.2	10.8	20.2	11.9	16.3	12.3	4.1	5.2	8.0	3.9
Underutilized by Hours	5.0	5.1	1.0	1.8	21.3	2.6	19.7	4.6	2.4	0.7
Underutilized by Income	11.0	19.3	4.2	11.0	0.4	7.9	--	8.3	6.8	7.9
Total Percent	100.1	100.1	100.1	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
(N)	(1528)	(702)	(101)	(263)	(9)	(200)	(10)	(196)	(505)	(186)

TABLE 5
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY
 (IN DOLLARS)

Nativity	NATIONAL ORIGIN				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Native	\$6,722	\$5,668	\$6,458	\$10,911	\$8,210
Foreign	\$5,313	\$7,344	\$7,425	\$7,615	\$8,566
Average	\$6,132	\$7,043	\$7,425	\$7,759	\$8,301

TABLE 6
UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY EDUCATION AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND SCHOOLING									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.	H.S.
	Dropout	Graduate*	Dropout	Graduate*	Dropout	Graduate*	Dropout	Graduate*	Dropout	Graduate*
Adequately Employed	66.5	80.2	67.9	84.2	71.2	80.6	79.7	82.8	77.4	88.6
Unemployed	7.9	10.4	16.9	10.8	13.7	11.5	0.9	7.8	9.1	5.4
Underutilized by Hours	6.3	3.2	2.2	0.8	2.6	4.1	7.9	3.7	2.9	1.3
Underutilized by Income	19.4	6.1	13.0	4.2	12.4	3.8	11.5	5.6	10.6	4.8
Total Percent	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1
(N)	(1261)	(970)	(203)	(160)	(93)	(116)	(80)	(125)	(277)	(414)

*High school graduate or more.

TABLE 7
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND SCHOOLING LEVELS
 (IN DOLLARS)

Completed Schooling Levels	NATIONAL ORIGIN				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Less than 6 years	\$4,876	\$7,053	\$5,717	\$6,707	\$5,381
Grade 6	\$6,027	\$6,843	\$4,447	\$5,164	\$6,165
7-11 years	\$4,572	\$5,988	\$6,223	\$6,702	\$6,109
High School graduate	\$7,745	\$7,538	\$7,819	\$8,996	\$9,149
Some College	\$7,138	\$8,319	\$6,665	\$7,847	\$9,935
College graduate	\$11,093	\$19,729	\$13,236	\$9,963	\$13,799
Average	\$6,132	\$7,043	\$7,425	\$7,759	\$8,380

TABLE 8
UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY PRIMARY LANGUAGE AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND LANGUAGE									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	English	Spanish	English	Spanish	English	Spanish	English	Spanish	English	Spanish
Adequately Utilized	79.9	61.8	82.2	67.7	89.2	70.5	82.0	81.6	85.5	78.9
Unemployed	9.5	8.5	11.6	16.2	5.4	15.7	6.5	2.0	7.9	4.2
Underutilized by Hours	3.3	6.8	1.3	2.1	3.3	3.6	7.1	3.9	1.4	2.9
Underutilized by Income	7.3	22.9	5.0	13.9	2.0	10.1	4.4	12.5	5.2	14.0
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1224)	(917)	(199)	(154)	(61)	(145)	(103)	(94)	(510)	(161)

TABLE 9
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND PRIMARY LANGUAGE
 (IN DOLLARS)

Primary Language	NATIONAL ORIGIN				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
English	\$7,138	\$7,835	\$9,462	\$9,159	\$9,422
Spanish	\$5,184	\$6,875	\$7,236	\$6,644	\$5,597
Other	\$7,475	-- ^a	-- ^a	-- ^a	\$8,231
Average	\$6,132	\$7,043	\$7,425	\$7,759	\$8,301

^aToo few cases for reliable estimates.

TABLE 10

UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY OCCUPATIONAL SECTORS AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND OCCUPATIONAL SECTORS									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Adequately Employed	77.2	64.7	82.2	70.9	75.3	87.6	83.0	84.2	87.7	77.2
Unemployed	6.4	11.2	8.6	12.6	12.3	7.0	5.8	1.6	4.7	8.8
Underutilized by Hours	3.7	6.5	1.1	2.2	3.4	0.3	5.0	2.6	1.5	2.0
Underutilized by Income	12.7	17.6	8.1	14.2	9.1	5.0	6.2	11.6	6.0	12.0
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
(N)	(1382)	(727)	(228)	(105)	(155)	(37)	(128)	(71)	(491)	(164)

TABLE 11

UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY INDUSTRY MARKET SECTORS AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND MARKET SECTORS									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	Core	Periphery	Core	Periphery	Core	Periphery	Core	Periphery	Core	Periphery
Adequately Employed	77.3	67.4	79.9	76.8	75.6	80.1	89.1	75.4	84.6	86.0
Unemployed	7.8	8.4	9.5	10.5	9.9	12.9	4.8	3.7	6.9	3.8
Underutilized by Hours	3.5	6.2	1.5	1.4	3.7	1.7	2.3	6.7	1.7	1.6
Underutilized by Income	11.4	18.0	9.1	11.3	10.8	5.3	3.8	14.2	6.8	8.6
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1168)	(942)	(202)	(130)	(103)	(88)	(117)	(83)	(414)	(241)

TABLE 12
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND OCCUPATIONAL SECTORS
 (IN DOLLARS)

Occupational Sectors	National Origin				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Primary	\$8040	\$7907	\$8152	\$9180	\$9580
Secondary	\$3741	\$5297	\$5825	\$6721	\$5616
Average	\$6195	\$7038	\$7398	\$7796	\$8380

TABLE 13
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND LABOR MARKET SECTORS
 (IN DOLLARS)

Labor Market Sectors	National Origin				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Core	\$7887	\$7870	\$9236	\$8812	\$9658
Periphery	\$4592	\$6334	\$6218	\$6769	\$6041
Average	\$6195	\$7038	\$7398	\$779	\$8380

TABLE 14
REGION AND UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization categories	National Origin and Region																			
	Mexican			Puerto Rican			Cuban			Central/South American			Other Spanish							
	NE ^a	NC ^b	South West	NE	NC	South West	NE	NC	South West	NE	NC	South West	NE	NC	South West					
Adequately Employed	--*	83.2	74.6	69.3	75.8	63.6	--*	89.2	84.6	--*	73.8	--*	78.8	--*	92.4	78.3	75.6	82.1	89.7	84.8
Unemployed	--	7.6	5.4	11.4	13.3	20.6	--	9.4	8.9	--	14.6	--	5.8	--	.7	6.9	14.5	2.1	2.8	6.3
Underutilized by Hours	--	3.4	3.8	6.0	1.7	2.9	--	0.0	3.3	--	2.1	--	4.2	--	.0	10.4	0.9	6.1	.0	2.9
Underutilized by Income	--	5.7	16.2	13.2	9.2	12.9	--	1.4	3.3	--	9.5	--	11.1	--	6.9	4.4	9.1	9.7	7.5	5.9
TOTAL	--	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	--	100.0	100.1	--	100.0	--	99.9	--	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	99.9
(N)		(200)	(784)	(1241)	(250)	(54)	--	(28)	(54)	--	(136)	--	(102)	--	(29)	(64)	(144)	(33)	(172)	(335)

^a Northeast.

^b Northcentral.

* Unreliable; category N less than 25.

TABLE 15
 MEDIAN 1975 WORK EARNINGS OF HISPANIC MALES
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND REGION OF RESIDENCE
 (IN DOLLARS)

Region	NATIONAL ORIGIN				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central/South American	Other Spanish
Northeast	\$7,787	\$6,950	\$9,708	\$7,563	\$8,182
North Central	\$7,916	\$7,413	\$4,605	\$14,852	\$10,362
South	\$5,689	\$8,118	\$6,488	\$9,924	\$8,524
West	\$6,110	\$6,479	\$10,136	\$7,448	\$7,990
Average	\$6,132	\$7,043	\$7,425	\$7,759	\$8,380

TABLE 16
MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS OF LABOR UTILIZATION: PROBABILITY OF ADEQUATE EMPLOYMENT AMONG
HISPANIC ORIGIN WORKERS BY NATIONAL ORIGIN, SELECTED SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC
AND LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS^a

Selected Characteristics	Mexican			Puerto Rican			Cuban			Central/ South American			Other Spanish		
	(N)	Gross	Net	(N)	Gross	Net	(N)	Gross	Net	(N)	Gross	Net	(N)	Gross	Net
Region															
Northeast	(3)	.16	.05	(219)	.02	.02	(51)	.06	.01	(97)	-.05	-.04	(131)	-.06	-.09
Northcentral	(171)	.11	.12	(47)	-.17	-.14	(9)	-.02	.03	(9)	.17	.13	(29)	--	.02
South	(744)	.02	.03	(16)	.09	.07	(120)	-.03	-.02	(27)	.09	.07	(163)	.04	.03
West	(1110)	-.03	-.04	(28)	.10	.06	(8)	.08	.14	(60)	.02	.01	(305)	--	.02
[eta and beta]		[.10]	[.11] ^e		[.20]	[.15] ^b		[.11]	[.08]*		[.17]	[.21]*		[.09]	[.13] ^c
Education															
Less than grade 6	(369)	-.15	-.10	(33)	-.17	-.11	(12)	-.23	-.12	(16)	-.06	-.02	(35)	.07	.07
Grade 6	(167)	-.07	--	(11)	.07	.07	(18)	-.03	--	(12)	.03	.04	(16)	-.57	-.54
7-11	(603)	-.03	-.02	(124)	-.06	-.06	(46)	-.03	-.06	(48)	--	.02	(193)	-.06	-.05
High school grad	(397)	.03	--	(88)	.08	.08	(44)	-.01	.01	(42)	-.07	-.07	(211)	--	--
Some college	(276)	.16	.11	(43)	.09	.07	(34)	.01	-.03	(34)	.02	.01	(94)	.06	.06
College grad or more	(115)	.21	.14	(10)	.08	.02	(33)	.15	.15	(40)	.08	.03	(80)	.14	.12
[eta and beta]		[.23]	[.15] ^e		[.23]	[.18]*		[.21]	[.19]*		[.14]	[.10]*		[.31]	[.29] ^e
Primary Language															
English	(1151)	.09	.07	(182)	.05	.04	(58)	.12	.15	(98)	.01	--	(474)	.02	.02
Spanish	(877)	-.11	-.09	(129)	-.07	-.05	(130)	-.05	-.07	(94)	-.01	--	(154)	-.06	-.05
[eta and beta]		[.22]	[.18] ^e		[.14]	[.10]*		[.18]	[.23] ^c		[.03]	[.00]*		[.10]	[.08] ^b
Nativity															
Native	(1363)	.04	--	(83)	-.01	-.09	(6)	-.37	-.42	(10)	-.07	-.09	(448)	-.01	-.03
Foreign	(665)	-.08	--	(227)	--	.03	(182)	.01	.01	(182)	--	.01	(181)	.03	.08
[eta and beta]		[.12]	[.00]*		[.01]	[.13]		[.16]	[.18] ^c		[.04]	[.06]*		[.05]	[.15] ^d
Market Sectors															
Core-primary	(839)	.07	.03	(130)	.03	.01	(91)	-.03	-.07	(83)	.05	.04	(315)	.03	.02
Mixed	(779)	-.02	-.01	(138)	.01	.02	(74)	.01	.04	(66)	-.04	-.03	(240)	-.04	-.04
Periphery-Secondary	(410)	-.11	-.04	(42)	-.13	-.10	(23)	.10	.17	(43)	-.03	-.04	(74)	-.01	.05
[eta and beta]		[.16]	[.06] ^c		[.13]	[.10] [*]		[.10]	[.19] ^c		[.11]	[.10] [*]		[.10]	[.09] ^o
Grand Mean		.73			.80			.77			.83			.85	
R ²		.102			.098			.140			.046			.129	
(N)		(2231)			(364)			(209)			(206)			(672)	

*Not significant.

^cp < .05

^aAge is introduced as a covariate in all models.

^dp < .01

^bp < .10

^ep < .001

TABLE A-1
UTILIZATION OF MALE HISPANIC WORKERS BY AGE AND NATIONAL ORIGIN

Utilization Categories	NATIONAL ORIGIN AND AGE														
	Mexican			Puerto Rican			Cuban			Central/S. American			Other Spanish		
	Young	Prime	Old	Young	Prime	Old	Young	Prime	Old	Young	Prime	Old	Young	Prime	Old
Adequately Employed	64.1	73.3	76.6	43.2	77.0	71.0	89.4	74.9	82.2	98.9	80.2	100.0	65.3	85.7	87.2
Unemployed	14.9	8.6	5.5	51.6	12.2	10.6	3.1	12.6	15.7	1.1	5.5	--	22.8	4.8	9.2
Underutilized by hours	7.9	4.5	5.8	4.8	1.0	8.7	7.4	3.7	--	--	5.8	--	6.9	1.5	1.3
Underutilized by income	13.1	13.5	12.2	0.4	9.8	9.7	--	8.9	2.1	--	8.5	--	5.0	8.1	2.3
Total Percent	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	10.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
(N)	(239)	(1818)	(151)	(21)	(317)	(20)	(19)	(158)	(26)	(6)	(191)	(9)	(63)	(544)	(72)

TABLE A-2

OCCUPATION DISTRIBUTION OF THE MALE HISPANIC EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN
LABOR FORCE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY

Major Occupation Groups	National Origin and Nativity									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born*	Foreign Born	Native Born*	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born
Professionals	7.4	3.3	9.5	5.9		12.3		15.8	8.6	18.0
Managers	6.3	4.5	8.8	6.6		12.8		8.4	8.4	10.2
Sales	2.9	1.5	3.4	4.6		8.0		1.7	5.2	2.8
Clerical	6.8	1.9	16.9	5.2		5.9		4.0	7.3	6.2
Craft	20.3	14.7	22.2	17.5		25.1		13.1	23.3	12.2
Operators	16.4	20.2	14.2	22.6		15.0		26.5	9.0	16.3
Transp. Equip. Operators	6.5	6.4	0.6	5.7		5.9		3.3	5.3	3.4
Non-farm Labor	12.8	15.3	6.9	10.4		8.0		3.3	14.2	6.9
Priv. Household	0.2	0.3	--	--		--		--	0.1	--
Other Service Workers	13.7	15.8	17.3	19.4		6.4		23.6	15.6	20.8
Farmers & Farm Managers	0.4	1.9	--	--		--		--	1.1	0.7
Farm Laborers & Supervisors	6.2	14.3	0.1	2.1		0.5		0.3	1.9	2.5
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9	100.0		99.9		100.0	100.0	100.0
(N)	(1588)	(711)	(111)	(261)		(187)		(194)	(297)	(110)

*Statistics unreliable due to small sample size (N < 25).

TABLE A-3

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE MALE HISPANIC POPULATION
AGED 25 AND OVER BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY

Years of Education Completed	National Origin and Nativity									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/ South American		Other Spanish	
	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign
Less than 6	17.8	42.9	2.7	23.2	36.9	9.0	--	10.3	9.6	17.8
Grade 6	4.4	18.1	0.5	6.7	--	15.4	10.7	5.8	3.4	4.9
7-11 Years	28.5	16.1	24.0	40.5	12.4	21.3	24.0	23.3	29.5	30.1
High School Grad.	25.7	13.0	51.1	17.9	44.0	24.8	46.8	21.4	32.6	24.2
Some College	15.9	6.0	13.6	8.3	--	13.7	8.8	16.7	11.8	10.1
College Graduate +	7.7	3.8	8.1	3.3	6.8	15.8	9.8	22.5	13.1	13.0
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1
Median	10		10		12		12		12	

TABLE A-4
INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE MALE HISPANIC EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE
OVER AGE 14 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN AND NATIVITY

Major Industry Group	National Origin and Nativity									
	Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Central/South American		Other Spanish	
	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born*	Foreign Born	Native Born*	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born
Agriculture	9.0	20.4	0.2	2.7		0.7		0.3	5.7	4.0
Mining	2.7	0.4	--	--		1.0		--	3.4	--
Construction	10.3	8.9	8.6	3.4		7.9		3.9	12.2	7.8
Durable Goods	13.8	18.2	9.9	26.1		13.7		24.0	11.5	5.3
Nondurable goods	9.0	11.9	7.5	13.1		12.6		9.5	4.4	14.4
Transp., Comm., & Public Utilities	6.9	4.7	9.0	8.2		5.1		6.2	8.8	8.1
Wholesale Trade	3.9	1.7	3.4	3.5		5.6		1.9	3.0	4.5
Retail Trade	16.0	15.3	11.4	16.7		20.6		13.2	16.2	25.2
Fin., Insur. & Real Estate	1.3	1.3	7.1	6.1		5.7		3.1	2.7	8.9
Business & Repair Service	4.3	4.5	9.2	5.3		8.3		11.2	5.1	5.5
Private Household	0.5	1.4	--	0.7		--		0.2	0.7	--
Private Non-Household	1.9	2.1	1.2	1.1		2.0		7.0	1.7	1.3
Entertainment & Recreational Serv.	1.4	1.2	9.1	1.1		4.2		0.3	1.7	0.3
Professionals & Related Serv.	10.7	5.5	10.6	7.8		9.5		15.5	12.2	14.0
Public Admin.	8.3	2.5	12.9	4.1		3.0		3.8	10.8	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.9		99.9		100.1	100.1	99.9
(N)	(1588)	(711)	(111)	(261)		(187)		(194)	(297)	(110)

*Statistics unreliable to small size (N < 25).

HISPANIC PARTICIPATION IN CETA: A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

Gilbert Cardenas*
Richard Santos

INTRODUCTION

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) is designed primarily to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons to enable them to secure self-sustaining, unsubsidized employment. It is the cornerstone of employment and training legislation.¹ CETA replaced a host of categorical federal programs and emphasized decentralized local programs. The evolution of employment and training legislation has also generated concern among employment activists, elected officials, community-based organizations, and government officials about issues such as program objectives, eligibility criteria, funding mechanisms, target population, local delivery systems, and overall program effectiveness. These issues have likewise been viewed with justified concern by the Hispanic community.² Compared to other workers, Hispanics have historically had rates of unemployment higher than those of Whites but lower than those of Blacks. In addition, Hispanic workers face language barriers, have low levels of education and skill training, and may reside in depressed labor markets such as border communities.

Consequently, concern with the overall participation of Hispanics in programs to overcome or reduce employment barriers is understandable. Participation studies are limited, however, because few data sources adequately identify Hispanic participants. Recent availability of CETA data sources does, however, provide for a preliminary review of Hispanic participation in CETA.

In this paper, the Hispanic profile in CETA employment programs is initially presented in the context of a universe of needs and of

*Dr. Gilbert Cardenas is a Brookings Institution Economic Policy Fellow, Washington, D.C. Dr. Richard Santos is Senior Research Associate at Ohio State University.

Research support for this paper was provided by the United States Department of Labor through the University of Texas at San Antonio Institutional Grant Program (No. 31-48-78-08).

CETA eligibility requirements. Next, an overall Hispanic participation will be given using published reports of detailed characteristics submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor. The third section of the paper will present an in depth Hispanic profile using data from the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Surveys (CLMS). The in depth profile will be followed by the post-CETA experience of Hispanic participants. The final section of the paper will analyze findings, suggest areas of further research, and discuss policy implications.

In the profile and post-CETA characteristics comparisons, Hispanics will be compared with White and Black participants. When they are evident, differences among the Hispanic groups, such as Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, and also differences by sex will be examined. The analysis will be restricted to the time period up to CETA reauthorization in late 1978. It is an appropriate restriction because the modified guidelines and eligibility requirements are quite recent and because the employment and training experience of CETA participants has predominantly followed the earlier guidelines. However, the final section addresses some of the implications of reauthorization on Hispanic participation.

Universe of Need and Eligibility Requirements³

From a human resource development perspective, employment and training services may be needed by the unemployed who can not locate employment, the low wage earner, or the worker who needs marketable skills. In fiscal 1980, there were an estimated 435,000 unemployed Hispanics, 1.6 million employed Hispanics whose income was below poverty level, and 3.1 million Hispanics 14 years and older with less than an eighth grade education.⁴

Within this framework, employment needs are absolute and not subject to budget constraints. Since there are, however, limited resources allocated to solving employment problems in the labor market, the government has established eligibility requirements for persons seeking employment and training services. Under CETA, persons who are unemployed for a specified duration, employed but with total family incomes below the poverty level, or receiving certain cash welfare are eligible for assistance.⁵ Using CETA eligibility requirements, a recent study estimated over a period of one year the following eligible population: 26.7 million, Title I; 12.2 million, Title II; 18.2 million, all provisions of Title VI; and 6.9 million for Title VIb.⁶

Since the eligible populations overlap among the titles and Title I is the broadest eligible category, it will be used as the benchmark for estimating a CETA universe of need. Table I compares the eligible CETA population and actual CETA participants. An analysis of the data shows that about 2.4 million persons were enrolled in Title I, II, and VI programs during fiscal 1977. Given an eligible population of at least 26.7 million, it means that, at best, about one in every nine

eligible persons is served. A crude benchmark by race reveals the approximate ratios: one in every fourteen eligible Whites received services; one in every six eligible Blacks; and one in every nine eligible Hispanics.⁷

Furthermore, an assessment by title participation reveals that Hispanics are overrepresented in Title I and underrepresented in Title VIb. A comparison of the characteristics of the participants and effectiveness of the program is, however, needed before generalizations can be made as to how particular groups are being served. These issues are examined using several data sources in the next sections.

HISPANIC PARTICIPATION IN CETA

Hispanic participation in CETA programs has increased over the years and has largely been dependent on labor market conditions and the allocation of federal funds at the national, state, and local levels. Furthermore, Hispanic participation has varied from title to title, region to region, and prime sponsor to prime sponsor. Overall Hispanic performance in CETA can be assessed through an analysis of participants' characteristics from data collected by prime sponsors and reported to the U.S. Department of Labor. Published reports on characteristics of CETA participants are also available from the Employment and Training Report of the President.⁸ The data provides limited information on the characteristics of Hispanics and others in manpower programs by title, region, and prime sponsor.

In this analysis emphasis will be given to overall participation, terminations, and the "entered employment" category.⁹ However, the data do not lend themselves to a complete analysis of minorities in manpower programs by specific characteristics such as age, sex, education, and wages. In the prime sponsor data source, non-Black Hispanics are included in the White group. However, specific data for Blacks and Hispanics are also provided. Furthermore, the Hispanic group cannot be classified by specific Hispanic enrollees, namely Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. Despite these limitations, a general overview of Hispanic participation will be presented. A regional and prime sponsor analysis will also be given.

General Overview

Enrollment Trends

Hispanic enrollments in CETA have varied from year to year and from title to title. In fiscal year 1975, over 130,000 Hispanics received manpower services under Title I as compared to 166,437 in fiscal year 1978, an increase of 22 percent. Between 1975 and 1978, Title II Hispanic enrollments dropped by 45 percent from 32,307 to 17,867. In Title VI, which was initiated largely as a temporary program of emergency public service employment, Hispanic enrollees

increased from 20,366 in fiscal 1975 to 99,657 in fiscal 1978. Significant changes in the number of enrollments have largely been dependent on the nature and priorities of manpower policy and the direction at the national level.

Participants in Title I programs receive services such as training, counseling, testing, and placement. As noted in Table 2, Hispanics represented 13 percent of the total enrollees in Title I in FY 1975, and about 14 percent in FY 1976 and FY 1977. Title II and VI provide public service employment, and participants are generally less likely to be economically disadvantaged or in minorities. Hispanic representation in Title II programs has dropped from 16 percent in FY 1975 to 14 percent in FY 1977. In 1976, it reached a low of 12 percent. In Title VI, Hispanic participation was 13 percent in 1975, 10 percent in FY 1976, and 12 percent in FY 1977. On the other hand, the proportion of Black and White participation in Title II and VI generally increased during this time period. White enrollment in Title VI, however, declined from FY 1975 to FY 1977.

Program Outcome

Hispanic participation in CETA can be assessed through an analysis of outcome classifications: participation, terminations, and "entered employment". Table 3 presents outcome classification in Title I and II. Outcome classification for Title VI is presented in Table 4. The "entered employment" category includes those participants who have been terminated and entered unsubsidized employment. In Title I programs Hispanics comprised about 12 percent, and Blacks comprised about 33 percent of all participants during fiscal year 1978. The relative distribution of Hispanics was similar in terms of termination, and "entered employment", 13 percent. For Blacks however, the "entered employment" rate was 28 percent of all enrollees, less than their representation of participants.

The relative representation of Hispanics decreased in public service employment under Title II and VI as compared to Title I. In Title II there were 30,000 Hispanic participants, or 9 percent of total enrollees. However, their distribution in terminations and "entered employment" was less. Seven percent of the total termination and 8 percent of the total terminees entering employment in Title II in FY 1978 were Hispanics. Blacks experienced similar trends in Title II: 23 percent of total participants, 21 percent of total terminations, and 18 percent of all persons who entered employment. Hispanics and Blacks comprised about 20 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of total participants in Title VI programs. The relative distribution of Hispanics and Blacks was much lower with respect to terminations and "entered employment" than Whites in Title VI.

Entered Employment Rate

One method which can be used to measure more accurately the performance of Hispanics in manpower programs is the "entered employment" rate concept. This statistical measure can be used to gauge the

success of CETA programs in placing participants into unsubsidized employment. The measure is calculated by the number of terminated participants entering employment as a percent of the total number of terminations. The Department of Labor has established 40-49 percent as the standard acceptable range for a prime sponsor's "entered employment" rate. According to Table 5, Black and Hispanic "entered employment" rates were lower in the three programs than the acceptable rates, and lower than Whites. For Hispanics, the rates were 39 percent in both Titles I and II, and 29 percent in Title VI.

Regional Analysis

Hispanics reside in all regions of the country. However, certain regions such as the Southwest, Northeast, and Southeast have large Hispanic populations; Chicanos in California and Texas; Puerto Ricans in Boston and New York; and Cubans in Florida. Table 6 presents CETA participation by region and race. Hispanics represented 10 percent or more of total participants in Title I in the following regions: Region I (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts), Region II (New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico), Region VI (Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma), Region VIII (Colorado, Utah), and Region IX (Arizona, California, and Nevada). The regional analysis also focuses on the Hispanic representation in overall terminations and "entered employment" category as well as on the percentage of Hispanic participants who entered employment. Table 7 and Table 8 present the regional data.

By regions, the representation of Hispanic participants was generally lower than that of either Blacks or Whites. In the Denver region, however, the representation of Hispanics was higher than that of Blacks. Hispanic participants had most favorable "entered employment" rates in Region IX (San Francisco), Region VIII (Colorado), and Region VI (Dallas) for Titles I, II, and VI respectively. For Hispanic participants, the most unfavorable rate was in Title VI for Region I (Boston).

Boston, Region I

Hispanics were largely represented in Title I programs: 10 percent of total participants. In public service employment, Hispanics represented four percent of total participants. In terms of terminations and "entered employment", Hispanics constituted about 10 percent in Title I. In public service employment, four percent of the terminations and less than three percent of those who entered employment were Hispanics. In this region, 37 percent of the Hispanics in Title I, 22 percent in Title II, and 20 percent in Title VI entered employment. By region, Boston had the lowest percentage of Hispanics who entered employment in public service employment.

New York, Region II

Hispanics represented one-fourth of total enrollees in Title I, but 16 percent in Title II and 21 percent in Title VI. Blacks were likewise overrepresented in Title I and underrepresented in public service employment. In Title I, the percentages of terminations and

entered employment who were Hispanics were similar to the overall Hispanic participation rate. However, the percentage of Hispanics by termination and "entered employment" in public service employment was about 3/4 of their participation rate. In Title I, 39 percent of the Hispanics entered employment as compared to about one-fourth of the Hispanics in public service employment.

Dallas, Region VI

Hispanics in this region totaled over one-fifth of all participants in Title I, II, and VI programs. As expected, this region had one of the highest rates of Hispanic participation. The distribution of Hispanics by overall terminations and "entered employment" was similar to their CETA participation rates. The entered employment rate of Hispanics was 44 percent in Title I, 43 percent in Title II, and 31 percent in Title VI.

Denver, Region VIII

Hispanics comprised 19 percent of total participants in Title I, 16 percent of those in Title II, and 18 percent in Title VI. The Hispanic distributions of overall terminations and "entered employment" in the various titles were similar to their participation rates. In Title II, 58 percent of the Hispanics entered employment, the largest percentage of any region. In Title VI, it was 29 percent and 45 percent in Title I.

San Francisco, Region IX

Nearly 30 percent of the total participants in Title I were Hispanics, representing the largest percentage of all the regions. In Titles II and VI, the respective Hispanic distributions were 17 percent and 21 percent. In addition, the Hispanic distributions of termination and "entered employment" rates were similar to their overall participation. Moreover, over half of the Hispanics in Title I entered employment. This rate was more than in any other region. In Title II and VI, the "entered employment" rates were 44 and 32 percent, respectively.

Prime Sponsor Analysis

There are over 450 prime sponsors delivering manpower services under CETA. Although many have been serving Hispanics, there are few prime sponsors which primarily serve Hispanics. However, some labor markets such as Albuquerque, San Antonio, New York, Los Angeles and Miami contain large Hispanic populations. Data from these prime sponsors provide a local analysis of Hispanic performance in manpower programs. Table 9 presents participation by race among the selected prime sponsors, and Table 10 notes the proportion of Hispanics by overall terminations and entered employment rates. Table 11 shows the entered employment rate of Hispanics by title.

In Albuquerque and San Antonio, over half of CETA participants were Hispanics. The other selected prime sponsors showed between 20

percent to 38 percent Hispanic participation in the various titles, except in public service employment in New York. Six percent of the participants in Title II and 13 percent in Title VI were Hispanics. In terms of favorable "entered employment" rates of Hispanic participation, the highest were found in Title I and II for New York and Title VI for San Antonio. The differences in "entered employment" rates of Hispanics compared to Whites and Blacks among the various titles were not uniform.

Albuquerque

Hispanics in Albuquerque comprised 60 percent of total participants in both Title I and Title II, and 59 percent in Title VI. However, 70 percent of all terminations and 48 percent of those who entered employment were Hispanic. In public service employment, the Hispanic representation of termination and entered employment was slightly lower than their participation rate. Furthermore, the percentage of Hispanic participation was quite low: 37 percent in Title I, 32 percent in Title II, and 23 percent in Title VI.

San Antonio

Sixty-five percent of the participants in Title I were Hispanics, 73 percent in Title II, and 57 percent in Title VI. As expected, the San Antonio prime sponsor had the largest Hispanic representation of total participants. The large percentage of Hispanics was also reflected in total terminations and "entered employment" rates. In terms of the Hispanics who entered employment, the rates were 51 percent in Title I; 32 percent in Title II; and 43 percent in Title VI.

New York

Hispanics represented approximately 30 percent of all participants in Titles I and VI in New York. However, they represented only six percent in Title II. The Hispanic proportion of terminations and "entered employment" rate was generally similar to their participation. In Title I, 49 percent of Hispanics entered employment as compared to about 24 percent in both Titles II and VI.

Los Angeles

Thirty percent of the participants in Title I were Hispanics. In Title II and VI, about one-fifth were Hispanics. In terms of total terminations and entered employment, the Hispanic representation was similar to the participation rate; except in Title II, where Hispanics represented 14 percent of the overall entered employment rate. The Los Angeles prime sponsor had the most favorable employment rate of Hispanic participants: 63 percent in Title I and 33 percent in Title II. In Title VI, the rate was 29 percent, second only to San Antonio.

Miami

More Hispanic participants were in public service employment than institutional training; 38 percent in Title II and 30 percent in Title VI, versus 26 percent in Title I. In Miami, Hispanic proportion of overall terminations and "entered employment" rate was slightly less

than their participation rate. For Hispanic participants, the "entered employment" rates were 37 percent in Title I, 30 percent in Title II, and 22 percent in Title VI.

A COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF THE CETA HISPANIC ENROLLEE

In addition to the data reported by prime sponsors, the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS) provides data on a nationwide sample of enrollees in employment and training programs under CETA.¹⁰ Thus, a more in depth participant profile can be constructed, and, in the case of Hispanics, a breakdown by Spanish origin group is possible. The CLMS, is a sample survey and does not survey every participant, but it is intended to be representative of the participant population. In order to get an in depth and detailed profile of the different Hispanic groups, a special computer tabulation was requested from the U.S. Department of Labor and Westat, Inc.¹¹ The profile in this section pertains to participants who enrolled in Fiscal 1978; i.e., October 1977 to September 1978.

CLMS Program Analysis¹²

All Programs

An estimated 2.4 million persons were enrolled in CETA programs during FY 1978 as noted in Table 12. Overall, 53 percent of the enrollees were males, and 47 percent were females. By race, Whites represented 47 percent of all enrollees; Blacks, 38 percent; Hispanics, 11 percent; other races, five percent. A total of 251,839 Hispanics were enrolled in CETA during FY 1978. Among the Hispanic enrollees, Chicanos represented 58 percent; Puerto Ricans, 22 percent; all other Spanish groups, 20 percent.

Enrollment in CETA programs can be further classified as shown in Table 13 by adult type programs and youth programs. Overall, 48 percent of total CETA enrollees were in adult programs. The majority of the enrollees were thus in youth programs. However, nearly 64 percent of the Blacks and 57 percent of the Hispanics were in youth programs as compared to only 41 percent of the White enrollees.

Adult Programs

An estimated 1.2 million persons were enrolled in CETA adult programs in FY 1978. Hispanics represented slightly less than 10 percent of all enrollees; Blacks, 29 percent; Whites 58 percent; and other races, four percent. Table 14 shows that the most predominant programs by racial group were classroom training for Hispanics and public service projects for Blacks and Whites. Classroom training represented 29 percent of adult activities for Hispanic, 25 percent for Blacks, and 20 percent for Whites. The combination of all types of adult public service employment programs accounted for 58 percent of the White enrollees, 48 percent of the Blacks, and 38 percent of the Hispanics.

Table 15 presents program activity by Hispanic group; Chicanos and others of Spanish origin each had the highest representation in classroom training: about 31 percent. Puerto Ricans had 23 percent in classroom training. The percentage of the combined public service employment programs by Hispanic group were as follows: 40 percent for Chicanos, 35 percent for Puerto Ricans, 37 percent for all other Spanish origin groups. Puerto Ricans, with 15 percent, had the highest percentage of CETA direct referrals of any group, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Youth Programs

Approximately 1.24 million persons received youth related employment services under CETA in FY 1978. As shown in Table 16, Blacks represented 46 percent of all enrollees in the youth related programs; Whites, 37 percent; Hispanics, 11 percent; other races, five percent.

The most frequent youth program type for all enrollees was the summer program, accounting for 68 percent of all activities. By race, the summer youth program accounted for 59 percent of White participation and 70 percent of Hispanics. Blacks had the highest representation, 74 percent. By Hispanic group, Table 17 shows that the highest summer program participation was among Puerto Ricans, 77 percent, and other Spanish origin groups, 78 percent. In contrast, only 64 percent of the Chicano participants were enrolled in summer programs.

The second most frequent youth program by race was the youth work experience program: Whites, 19 percent; Blacks, 11 percent; Hispanics, 12 percent. By Hispanic group, nearly 16 percent of the Chicanos were in youth work experience. However, Puerto Ricans and others of Spanish origin accounted for only about six percent of their enrollees in this program.

CLMS Adult Profile

Overall

Table 18 compares selected socioeconomic characteristics of CETA adult participants by race. Hispanics tended to have the lowest percentage of young adult participants between 18 and 21 years of age. In addition, Hispanics had the highest percentage of enrollees who did not have high school degree, who were not veterans, and who supported two or more respondents. Hispanics also had a slightly higher percentage of enrollees who were outside the labor force more than 50 percent of the year. In addition, 17 percent of the Hispanics listed limited English as an employment barrier in contrast to only one percent for Blacks or Whites.

Economically, Hispanic enrollees fell between the statuses of the White and Black enrollees. At time of program entry, about one-fifth of all enrollees under study were employed. Most enrollees entered a CETA program to obtain employment, but Hispanics had the highest

proportion who desired job training. In comparison to Whites, Blacks and Hispanics tended to learn about CETA through friends and relatives.

Table 19 compares the characteristics of Hispanics by Spanish origin. Among Hispanic enrollees, there is some variation in terms of characteristics. In general, Chicano and Puerto Rican enrollees were more similar than the other Spanish origin group. For example, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans had a higher percentage of enrollees who had not completed high school. A higher percentage of Chicanos were veterans. On the other hand, Puerto Ricans had the highest percentage earning less than \$3,000 in the year prior to program entry.

Education and English Ability

Overall, 44 percent of the Hispanics had not completed 12 years of schooling, compared to Blacks 34 percent, and Whites 27 percent. By Hispanic group, 48 percent of the Chicanos and 46 percent of the Puerto Ricans did not obtain schooling beyond this level. The other Spanish origin groups showed 31 percent completing less than 12 years of schooling.

The listing of limited English as an employment barrier also varied by Hispanic group. For instance, 23 percent of the Puerto Ricans and 22 percent of the other Spanish-origin groups viewed limited English as one of their employment barriers. Among Chicano enrollees, 13 percent of the group viewed English as a problem.

Economic Comparison

Hispanics generally fell between Whites and Blacks in economic levels. For example, 68 percent of the White enrollees and 80 percent of the Blacks were classified as "economically disadvantaged." Among Hispanics, 73 percent of the enrollees were in this classification. In addition, 90 percent of both Hispanic and Black participants were below the lower living standard, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, in comparison to 68 percent of the Whites. The distribution of participant's earnings the year prior to enrollment also varied. The percentage of enrollees earning less than \$3,000 were as follows: Whites, 65 percent; Hispanics, 68 percent; and Blacks, 73 percent. However, 75 percent of the Puerto Rican enrollees earned less than this amount.

Enrollees who received any type of public assistance also varied by racial group. Black enrollees had the highest percentage who received public assistance, with 43 percent. Among Whites, 21 percent were receiving public assistance. Overall 30 percent of Hispanics were on some type of public assistance, but the rate was 38 percent for Puerto Ricans.

Employment Status at Entry

At the time of program entry, about one-fifth of the enrollees were employed. All the Hispanic group followed this pattern, except

for Puerto Ricans. Among the Puerto Ricans, only 17 percent were employed. Nearly half of the enrollees, regardless of racial background, were unemployed at entry data.

Reasons for CETA Participation

Obtaining a job was the most predominant reason why an enrollee sought entry into a CETA program: Whites, 72 percent; Blacks, 71 percent; Hispanics, 62 percent. There was also a higher proportion of Hispanics, 24 percent, and Blacks, 22 percent, who wanted job training in comparison to 18 percent of the Whites. In addition, four percent of the Hispanics sought entry in order to improve their English. For the most part, this service was not sought by Blacks and Whites. However, there was variation in seeking English instruction by Hispanic group, as noted by the following distribution: Chicanos, three percent; Puerto Ricans, four percent, and other Spanish groups, seven percent.

CETA Information

Most enrollees learned about CETA through their friends and relatives. Nearly half of the Hispanic and Black enrollees obtained their CETA information through a network of family or friends as compared to 39 percent of the Whites. The state employment service was used for information by 25 percent of the Whites, 20 percent of the Blacks, and 17 percent of the Hispanics. Among the Hispanic groups, the Puerto Ricans relied least on the employment service, eight percent.

CLMS Youth Profile

Overall

Table 20 and Table 21 present, respectively, a comparison of enrollees in youth programs by race and Hispanic groups. At time of program entry, 37 percent of the Hispanics were enrolled in school or training which was slightly higher than the rate for Blacks and Whites. However, 50 percent the Puerto Ricans were enrolled in school or training. For both Whites and Blacks, half of the enrollees were in the labor force at time of program entry, as compared to 43 percent of Hispanics. Among Puerto Ricans, only one out of every four enrollees was in the labor force. Blacks and Hispanics had a higher percentage of enrollees earning less than \$1,000 in the year prior to entry, as compared to Whites. In addition, Hispanics learned about CETA through friends and relatives more often than did other enrollees.

Education and English Ability

Since the programs are intended for youth, and nearly three-quarters of the participants were under the age of 18 years, one would expect the majority of enrollees to have not yet completed high school. The educational distribution of enrollees completing less than 12 years of schooling were as follows: Whites, 81 percent; Blacks, 80 percent; and Hispanics, 83 percent.

Approximately five percent of the Hispanics enrolled in youth related programs viewed limited English as an employment barrier. By Hispanic groups, the distribution of enrollees who viewed limited English as an employment problem was as follow: Chicanos, six percent; Puerto Ricans, three percent; and other Spanish origin group, five percent.

Economic Comparison

Among Blacks and Hispanics, about 84 percent of enrollees were economically disadvantaged, as compared to 74 percent of the Whites. Puerto Ricans had the highest percentage classified as economically disadvantaged, 93 percent. In terms of the lower living standard classification, 88 percent of the Whites, 95 percent of the Blacks, and 97 percent of the Hispanics were below it. As for family size, Blacks and Hispanics tended to be in larger families. Among Blacks, one in every three participants was in a family with seven or more members as compared to slightly more than one in five for Whites. However, at least 90 percent of all participants did not have any dependent. These figures suggest that most youth are single, or if married, without children, but residing in family units.

By family income, 11 percent of the Hispanics were in families with less than \$3,000 income as compared to 16 percent for Blacks and Whites. In families with \$15,000 or more income, distribution by race was as follows: Whites, 11 percent; Blacks, six percent; Hispanics, five percent. The percentage of participants who received some type of public assistance also varied: Whites, 38 percent; Blacks, 55 percent; and Hispanics, 50 percent. Among Hispanics, the range of public assistance varied from 70 percent for Puerto Ricans to 42 percent for Chicanos.

In the year prior to entering a CETA youth related program, most enrollees earned less than \$1,000: Whites, 78 percent; Blacks, 85 percent; and Hispanics, 84 percent. By Hispanic group, 96 percent of the Puerto Ricans and 91 percent of the other Spanish origin category earned less than \$1,000. On the other hand, 77 percent of the Chicano enrollees earned less than this amount. The lower earnings of youth enrollees can more adequately be understood by examining labor force status both at entry of program and during the year prior to entry. Since the participants are generally under 18 years of age, it is likely that the majority would be outside the labor force and in school.

Employment Status and School Enrollment

The percentage of enrollees who were outside the labor force more than half of the year prior to program entry was as follows: Whites, 83 percent; and Blacks and Hispanics, 87 percent each. However, 97 percent of the Puerto Ricans were outside the labor force for more than half of the year. At time of program entry, over half of the White and Black enrollees were in the labor force as compared to 43 percent of Hispanics. However, the rate was only 24 percent for

Puerto Ricans. Both Chicanos and others of Spanish origin had a participation rate of about 49 percent.

A slightly higher percentage of Hispanic enrollees were in school/training and not employed; 37 percent of Hispanics, compared with 35 percent of Blacks and 32 percent of Whites. Among Puerto Ricans, nearly half were enrolled in school/training. Of enrollees who were employed and in school, the distribution was five percent for Whites, two percent for Blacks, and three percent for Hispanics.

At time of program entry, less than 16 percent of all enrollees were employed and not in school. Among the different groups, however, Chicanos had the highest employed distribution, 19 percent.

Reasons for CETA Enrollment

Most youth participated in CETA to obtain a job. This reason was given by 86 percent of Whites, 89 percent of the Blacks, and 81 percent of the Hispanics. However, nearly 15 percent of Hispanic enrollees in youth programs sought job training as compared to only eight percent of either Whites or Blacks. The large percentage of Hispanics seeking job training was mainly accounted for by Chicanos, 19 percent.

CETA Information

Friends, relatives, and schools were the most frequently cited information sources about CETA. Among Hispanics, over half of the enrollees learned about CETA through friends and relatives, as compared to 43 percent of Whites and 41 percent of Blacks. The schools were also a major information source with the following distribution: Whites, 38 percent; Blacks, 45 percent; and Hispanics, 32 percent. The state employment service, on the other hand, played a minor role: Only four percent of the Whites and nearly three percent of Blacks and Hispanics learned about CETA through the employment service. Less than one percent of Puerto Ricans and two percent of the Chicanos relied on the employment service. However, six percent of the other Spanish origin group used it.

Summary of CLMS Profile.

According to the data from the CLMS, an estimated 2.4 million persons participated in CETA programs during FY 1978. Of these CETA participants, 251,839 enrollees, or 11 percent of the total, were Hispanic. The majority of the White enrollees participated in adult programs, but the majority of Black and Hispanic enrollees were in youth programs. Within youth programs most enrollees were in the summer program, which is designed to promote school attendance.

In the CETA adult programs, 109,773 Hispanic enrollees participated, and they were more likely to be enrolled in classroom training than either Blacks or Whites. Hispanics were least likely to participate in public service programs aimed at adults. Chicanos had a higher participation rate in classroom training than the overall

Hispanic rate. Puerto Ricans had the highest direct referral rate of any group.

In general, the socioeconomic characteristics of the Hispanic enrollees in adult programs reflect more the patterns of Blacks than Whites. However, Hispanics tended to have higher percentages than other enrollees of those who did not complete high school, supported more dependents, and were outside the labor force a slightly longer during the year prior to program entry. Of all the groups, Puerto Ricans showed the highest proportion earning less than \$3,000 in the year prior to entry.

In the youth programs a total of 142,064 Hispanics were enrolled, 11 percent of total participants. Most youth in the summer program were of school age, and about four-fifths of the enrollees had not completed high school. At time of program entry, less than half of the Hispanics were in the labor force. Among Puerto Ricans, the rate was about 25 percent. In the year prior to program entry, nearly all of the Puerto Ricans earned less than \$1,000.

Two additional features of the characteristics of adult and youth Hispanic participants are significant: (1) the extent to which limited English is a potential employment barrier, and (2) reasons for CETA participation and program information sources. Overall, 17 percent of the Hispanics in adult programs viewed limited English as an employment problem. The language barrier was more frequent for Puerto Ricans and others of Spanish origin. The problem appears to diminish among younger people; only five percent of the Hispanics in youth programs considered it a barrier. However, among Hispanics, Chicano youth showed the highest percentage viewing English as a problem.

The vast majority of Hispanics, like the other enrollee groups, entered a CETA program in hopes of obtaining a job. However, Hispanics in both the youth and adult program expressed a greater desire for job training than other groups. In addition, the most frequent way all enrollees learned about CETA programs was through friends and relatives. Hispanics relied on this source more than Blacks or Whites. The employment service provides CETA information to Puerto Ricans the least of all the groups in adult programs, eight percent. Less than four percent of all enrollees in youth programs relied on the employment service.

THE POST-EXPERIENCE OF CETA PARTICIPANTS

Data on the post program experience of Hispanics and other CETA participants is available from the CLMS Report No. 2, and the 18 month follow-up report on CETA participants and their post termination employment and earnings.¹³ The report covers a sample of participants who entered CETA between July 1975 and June 1976 (fiscal year 1976) who were enrolled in CETA Titles I, II, and VI. The major finding

shows that participation increased their employment and earnings upon termination, and were enjoying earnings noticeably above those they had prior to CETA enrollment. Both post program employment and earnings improved over time. Employment and earnings for all participants were higher a year after the participants left the program than in the first months after termination. The post-employment situation in CETA programs was generally more favorable for Hispanics than for Blacks, but less favorable than for Whites.

Employment Status.

Table 22 reviews the employment and unemployment status of the various groups one month before entry into CETA and compares it to their status three months after termination. After CETA participation, all groups improved their employment situation even though unemployment remained higher among Blacks and Hispanics. For example, one month before entry to CETA, 48 percent of the Whites were unemployed; three months after termination only 21 percent of the Whites were unemployed.

Prior to CETA entry, 54 percent of the Blacks were unemployed; three months after termination, 34 percent of the Black CETA participants were unemployed. In the case of Hispanics, 46 percent of the CETA enrollees were unemployed prior to entry, but only 26 percent were unemployed three months after termination. This represented a decrease in unemployment of 57 percent to Whites, 37 percent for Blacks, and a 43 percent decrease for Hispanics.

CETA participants who had been out of the program for 12 months also had lower unemployment rates. Table 23 presents the unemployment rate of participants who terminated their program at least 12 months previously. For Whites, the rate was 17 percent, and Blacks, 30 percent. Even though the rate of Hispanics was based on a small number of observations, the unemployment rate was 22 percent. Thus, unemployment rates continued to decrease beyond the three month period after termination.

Hourly Earnings.

Data collected on average hourly wage for CETA trainees who were out at least 12 months and who were working is presented in Table 24. Post CETA average hourly wages are given for the immediate period after training (one to three months post CETA) and a longer term (10-12 months post CETA). Average hourly wages increased for all the groups for both periods as compared to one to three months before program entry. Average hourly wages for Whites increased initially from \$3.14 to \$3.37, then to \$3.88. For Blacks, the initial average wage was \$3.05, increasing to \$3.25 and \$3.59. Prior to program entry, Hispanics earned an average of \$2.98 an hour. After program completion, the average wages were \$3.13 and \$3.57 for the two time periods under study. For Whites, the percentage increases were seven

percent for the three month post-period and 24 percent for the 12 month post-period. In the three month post-period, the increases were seven percent for Blacks and five percent for Hispanics. In the longer period, the increases were 18 percent for Blacks and 20 percent for Hispanics. Minority participants, thus, appear to earn less on average than Whites. In addition, the average wages of Hispanics trail Black participants. A year after program completion however, the hourly wages of Blacks and Hispanics were similar.

Annual Earnings.

Earnings from fourth-quarter prior to program entry to fourth-quarter after terminations increased for all participants terminated at least 12 months. Table 25 presents the absolute and proportional change in annual earnings for the time periods under study. Whites increased their earnings by \$2,430, Blacks by \$1,650, and Hispanics by \$2,080. For Whites and Hispanics, the percentage change was identical, 78 percent. For Blacks, the relative increase was 74 percent.

EMPLOYMENT POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Hispanics are more likely to participate in Title I of CETA, classroom training, as compared to Titles II and VI, public service employment. Although many Hispanics have been served through CETA, a large segment of the population continues to be in need of employment and training services. With present recessionary conditions, it is likely that the Hispanic eligible population will increase substantially. The groups most likely to be the hardest hit by the recession include Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, young workers, and those with English problems.

The overall Hispanic experience with CETA is favorable, as it is for all participants. As a whole, employment, hourly wages, and annual earnings increase for participants who completed CETA programs. However, Hispanics tend to show slightly more favorable employment and earnings progress than Blacks, but less than Whites. In addition, the socioeconomic characteristics of Hispanic enrollees reflect more the patterns of Blacks than Whites. However, Hispanics tend to have higher percentages than other enrollees of those who did not complete high school, were generally poor, economically disadvantaged, and viewed limited English ability as a major barrier to employability. Furthermore, lower socioeconomic conditions were more acute for Puerto Ricans and Chicanos as compared to other Hispanic groups.

Overall, the majority of Hispanics were enrolled in youth programs, (as was also the case for Blacks). Among Hispanics in adult programs, about a third were in classroom training. Depending on the region of prime sponsor, overall CETA participation and public service employment varied. Participation in CETA was generally more favorable for Hispanics in regions located in the Southwest. However, regions

such as Boston and New York contained a large percentage of Hispanic participants, especially in Title I. Under prime sponsors such as Albuquerque and San Antonio, which have large Hispanic populations, over half of the participants were Hispanic. In Miami, more Hispanic participants were in public service employment as compared with Title I.

A major trend thus appears to be the variability in Hispanic participation by title, region, and prime sponsor. A large portion of the variability is understandable given the Hispanic need for classroom training and general distribution of the population. However, the variability also underscores the need for close monitoring of Hispanic CETA participation, by the U.S. Department of Labor. That is DOL should monitor Hispanic participation at the regional and prime sponsor levels on a regular basis and publish periodic reports. Meetings with community-based groups and prime sponsors should also be held to discuss the most effective ways to increase Hispanic employability. Funding for groups such as Service Employment and Redevelopment, which aim to enhance Hispanic participation, should also be increased. Participation in CETA is also a function of Hispanic input at the various levels of the employment and training process. Consequently, efforts to recruit Hispanic staff into CETA, increase Hispanic data sources, and increase Hispanic membership on commissions, such as the National Council of Employment and Policy and the National Commission for Employment Policy, could increase the effectiveness of CETA.

Finally, additional research is needed at the micro level to assess the effectiveness of CETA programs on the employability of Hispanics. For example, how will the new and expanded role of the private sector under CETA benefit Hispanics? Given the lower participation of Hispanics in public service employment relative to other groups, will the new private sector emphasis mean that Hispanics will lose their opportunity to participate in public service employment? In short, what programs work best for Hispanics, and under what conditions? Furthermore, what delivery systems work best, and what is the proper role for community-based organizations? These are research issues which are worth pursuing so that CETA resources can be used to increase Hispanic employability.

NOTES

¹The objectives of CETA and description of legislation are noted in U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Report of the President (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979), p. 30.

²For a review of issues relating to CETA and Hispanics, refer to Fred E. Romero, Chicano Workers: Their Utilization and Development (University of California at Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center Publications Monograph No. 8, 1979) and SER/JOBS for Progress, Inc. "Impact of the First Year Implementation of CETA on the Spanish-Speaking," FORD/CETA Research Project unpublished report, 1975.

³The universe of need and eligibility section is based on projections and estimates from William Barnes, "Target Groups" in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues (Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23, May 1978).

⁴Data on the Hispanic universe of need is based on data collected from the Current Population Survey of March, 1979.

⁵Barnes, p. 70.

⁶Barnes, p. 74.

⁷The computation for the participant/eligible ratios by race is as follows: total eligible population in Title I is multiplied by the percent of eligible minority to yield eligible minority population. The percent of minority participants for each of the titles listed in Table II is multiplied by the total number of participants for each title to yield total number of minority CETA participants. The number of participants is then divided by the eligible population for each of the groups to obtain participants/eligible ratios.

⁸Participation rate is defined by the percentage of enrolled participants divided by the percentage of CETA eligible population. Termination rate is defined by the number of total termination divided by the number of total participants. Entered employment rate is defined by the number of terminated participants entering employment divided by the number of participants.

⁹Data were collected from the Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics with the appropriate assistance of the Office of Program Evaluation, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

¹⁰For a description of the CLMS, refer to Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, Technical Report No. 1, Methodology, March 1977, Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor.

¹¹Appreciation for promptly providing the special computer tabulation is extended to Jaime Selgado, U.S. Department of Labor and Tina Olsen of Westat, Inc., a private firm involved in collecting and analyzing the CLMS.

¹²In some cases, the number of observations in the CLMS analysis may drop below the minimum level and the standard error could exceed 10 percent. In general the minimum cell size specifications are 7,500 for adult programs, 20,000 for youth programs, and 15,000 for the combined programs.

¹³Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Study, Follow-up Report No. 2. Post program experiences and pre/post comparison for terminees who entered CETA during fiscal year 1976 (July 1975-June 1976), March 1977. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor.

TABLE 1

CETA Participants as Compared to Eligible Population

	CETA ^{a/}								U. S. Unemployed	U. S. Population
	<u>I</u>		<u>II</u>		<u>VIa</u>		<u>VIb</u>		<u>1977 Annual Average</u>	<u>16 to 65, 1975</u>
	<u>Part.</u>	<u>Elig.</u>	<u>Part.</u>	<u>Elig.</u>	<u>Part.</u>	<u>Elig.</u>	<u>Part.</u>	<u>Elig.</u>		
Total Number (Millions)	1.416	26.723	.188	12.200	.390	13.205	.510	6.883	6.855	122.684
Percent Minority										
White	51.2	72.8	67.2	71.6	64.8	71.6	58.4	59.4	73.7	83.9
Black	33.2	17.3	22.0	18.4	26.3	18.4	32.9	28.4	19.7	9.8
Hispanic	11.4	7.8	7.5	7.9	5.9	7.9	6.5	10.2	6.6	4.7

a/ Eligibility data are 1975 and participant data are for February 1977. 1975 eligibility data will approximate those for February 1977. Eligibles are underestimated for a variety of reasons, and despite the higher 1975 unemployment rate, the number of eligibles is very likely an underestimate for 1977.

Source: Data is extracted from Table 4, "Number and Characteristics of CETA Participants and Eligibles," by William Barnes in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues.

TABLE 2
Characteristics of Participants in
CETA Employment Programs
Fiscal 1975-1977

CETA									
Characteristics	Title I			Title II			Title VI		
	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977	Fiscal 1975	Fiscal 1976	Fiscal 1977
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Male	54.4	54.1	51.5	65.8	62.8	60.0	70.2	65.1	64.1
Female	45.6	45.9	48.5	34.2	36.2	40.0	29.8	34.9	35.9
Economically Disadvantaged	77.3	75.7	78.3	48.3	46.5	48.9	43.6	44.1	66.6
Race									
White	54.6	55.3	56.7	65.1	61.4	70.6	71.1	68.2	66.2
Black	38.5	37.1	34.7	21.8	26.5	22.9	22.9	23.0	25.9
Hispanic Origin	12.5	14.0	13.7	16.1	12.4	13.5	12.9	9.9	12.0
Limited English-Speaking Ability	4.1	5.1	5.2	8.0	4.3	2.5	4.6	3.5	2.9

Source: U.S. Department of Labor. Employment and Training Report of the President.

TABLE 3
CETA PARTICIPANTS, TERMINATIONS, AND ENTERED EMPLOYMENT
IN TITLE I, TITLE II BY RACE, FISCAL YEAR, 1978
(In Thousands)

	TITLE I						TITLE II					
	Participants No.	%	Termination No.	%	Entered Employment No.	%	Participants No.	%	Termination No.	%	Entered Employment No.	%
Total	1347	100.0	1018	100.0	455	100.0	342	100.0	112	100.0	38	100.0
White	798	59.2	604	59.2	295	64.8	244	71.3	73	65.4	30	79.0
Black	445	33.0	338	33.1	128	28.1	78	22.8	23	20.6	7	18.0
Spanish	167	12.4	130	12.8	58	12.8	30	8.8	7	6.5	3	7.0

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, 1979

TABLE 4
CETA PARTICIPANTS
TERMINATIONS, AND ENTERED EMPLOYMENT
IN TITLE VI BY RACE, FISCAL YEAR 1978
(In thousands)

	PARTICIPANTS		TERMINATIONS		ENTERED EMPLOYMENT	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	1014	100.0	529	100.0	161	100.0
White	656	64.7	357	67.5	120	74.5
Black	284	20.0	143	27.0	32	19.9
Spanish	95	9.8	45	8.5	13	8.1

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1979.

TABLE 5
CETA TERMINATION AND ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATES
IN TITLE I, II, VI PROGRAMS BY RACE
U. S. FISCAL YEAR 1978

	TERMINATION RATES			ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATES		
	TITLE I	II	VI	TITLE I	II	VI
White	75.6	49.3	54.3	48.8	41.1	33.9
Black	75.8	46.8	50.2	37.9	28.3	22.6
Hispanic	77.9	40.4	44.8	39.3	39.3	29.3

TABLE 6
CETA PARTICIPANTS IN TITLE I, II AND TITLE VI
BY REGION AND RACE
(PERCENT OF TOTAL)

Region	TITLE I (Percent)			TITLE II			TITLE VI		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
I	76.9	17.6	10.3	86.5	10.7	4.1	86.4	11.1	4.3
II	47.2	30.4	25.8	57.2	21.5	15.9	53.6	24.4	20.6
III	54.0	42.8	3.8	74.4	24.7	1.3	66.7	32.2	2.0
IV	49.8	48.8	2.2	63.3	35.8	2.1	52.6	46.4	1.9
V	60.3	35.4	6.5	75.0	23.0	2.3	69.4	27.7	2.6
VI	63.3	33.4	20.5	66.5	31.0	23.3	60.5	36.5	22.4
VII	70.8	26.2	2.9	68.9	29.6	1.8	70.8	27.2	1.6
VIII	77.9	8.6	10.6	83.2	5.0	16.4	80.0	5.9	18.4
IX	63.9	21.6	29.5	67.6	18.8	17.4	64.8	21.2	20.7
X	76.6	8.9	6.0	85.0	6.5	3.4	83.8	6.7	4.1

TABLE 7
HISPANIC PARTICIPATION IN CETA PROGRAMS
TITLE I, II, VI, BY REGION AND RACE, FISCAL YEAR 1978
(PERCENT OF TOTAL)

REGION	PARTICIPANTS			TERMINATIONS			ENTERED EMPLOYMENT		
	I	II	VI	I	II	VI	I	II	VI
I	10.3	4.1	4.3	10.4	3.9	3.7	9.3	2.8	2.6
II	25.8	15.9	20.6	25.3	9.7	14.5	22.1	6.9	12.2
III	3.8	1.3	2.0	2.7	1.2	1.8	2.2	.8	1.6
IV	2.2	2.1	1.9	2.5	1.4	1.4	2.7	1.2	1.3
V	6.5	2.3	2.6	7.0	2.0	2.4	6.5	1.9	2.4
VI	20.5	23.3	22.4	20.9	21.5	22.2	20.1	25.2	23.0
VII	2.9	1.8	1.6	3.0	1.5	1.4	3.7	1.0	1.7
VIII	18.6	16.4	18.4	18.2	15.7	20.3	15.9	19.9	17.8
IX	29.5	17.4	20.7	29.8	17.2	19.7	29.0	17.1	19.7
X	6.0	3.4	4.1		3.6	4.3	6.4	3.5	4.1

TABLE 8
CETA ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATES IN U.S. MANPOWER PROGRAMS
BY PROGRAM TITLE, REGION, RACE, FY 1978

Region	TITLE I			TITLE II			TITLE VI		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
I	41.9	39.3	36.9	33.9	18.3	22.7	29.2	19.5	19.5
II	50.0	43.5	39.0	40.2	19.5	24.1	31.7	20.0	23.5
III	40.6	37.7	32.8	39.0	27.0	24.5	33.0	24.5	27.9
IV	45.2	31.4	41.8	42.2	31.7	35.0	36.0	22.3	26.6
V	50.4	35.7	41.3	38.5	24.0	34.3	35.1	20.8	31.4
VI	49.2	38.9	43.8	41.4	28.0	43.0	34.0	24.8	31.4
VII	55.4	45.7	46.6	34.8	30.3	23.2	35.6	20.2	38.5
VIII	52.4	53.4	45.3	44.4	51.9	57.5	36.8	22.9	29.4
IX	56.3	49.8	52.4	46.7	37.9	43.7	33.4	25.9	31.8
X	43.0	38.0	43.3	44.9	35.3	42.1	35.4	27.5	32.6

TABLE 9
CETA PARTICIPANTS IN SELECTED PRIME SPONSORS
BY PROGRAM TITLE, RACE, FY 1978

	Albuquerque		San Antonio		New York		Los Angeles		Miami	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
TITLE I										
Total	3,117	100.0	7,216	100.0	46,754	100.0	20,357	100.0	11,867	100.0
White	2,602	83.5	5,624	78.0	17,993	38.5	9,643	47.4	5,539	46.7
Black	244	7.8	1,533	21.2	21,404	45.8	8,244	40.5	5,603	47.2
Hispanic	1,866	59.9	4,714	65.3	13,776	29.5	6,075	29.8	3,067	25.8
TITLE II										
Total	544	100.0	1,223	100.0	7,188	100.0	3,245	100.0	1,232	100.0
White	481	88.4	1,046	85.5	2,929	40.8	1,421	43.7	748	60.7
Black	40	7.3	175	14.3	3,042	42.3	1,267	39.0	449	36.4
Hispanic	324	59.6	894	73.0	456	6.3	631	19.5	470	38.1
TITLE VI										
Total	2,212	100.0	5,668	100.0	28,178	100.0	14,023	100.0	6,933	100.0
White	1,335	60.3	4,222	74.5	9,388	33.3	5,661	40.4	3,503	50.5
Black	877	39.6	1,412	24.9	15,497	55.0	6,441	45.9	3,236	46.6
Hispanic	1,281	57.9	3,233	57.0	3,738	13.2	3,012	21.5	2,106	30.4

TABLE 10
HISPANIC PARTICIPATION IN CETA PROGRAMS IN
SELECTED PRIME SPONSORS
IN TITLE I, II, IV, BY REGION AND RACE, FISCAL YEAR 1978

PRIME SPONSOR	PARTICIPANTS			TERMINATIONS			ENTERED EMPLOYMENT		
	I	II	VI	I	II	VI	I	II	VI
Albuquerque	59.9	59.6	57.9	69.5	55.4	57.0	48.3	51.9	57.6
San Antonio	65.3	73.0	57.0	67.5	61.6	49.7	71.3	61.6	59.9
New York	29.5	6.3	13.2	28.5	6.4	14.1	26.0	4.6	10.0
Los Angeles	29.8	19.5	21.5	28.9	20.3	20.6	28.6	14.4	22.8
Miami	25.8	38.1	30.4	24.5	29.6	24.8	22.1	33.7	24.6

TABLE 11
CETA ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATES IN
SELECTED PRIME SPONSORS
BY PROGRAM TITLE I, II, VI AND RACE, FY 1978

Prime Sponsor	TITLE I			TITLE II			TITLE VI		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
Albuquerque	45.0	27.6	37.0	34.3	42.1	31.9	24.5	18.0	23.4
San Antonio	50.4	39.9	51.0	32.2	31.5	31.5	37.8	29.7	42.8
New York City	56.4	48.0	48.6	43.3	22.6	24.6	40.9	28.0	23.9
Los Angeles	67.1	55.8	63.0	73.0	49.5	33.1	29.8	20.6	29.2
Miami	49.9	32.0	36.6	31.7	14.5	30.0	23.9	19.1	21.5

TABLE 12
CETA ENROLLEES IN FY 1978 BY RACE
AND HISPANIC GROUP

	RACE GROUP				
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>	<u>OTHER</u>
ESTIMATED NUMBER ^a	2.39 ^b	1.1 ^b	902,390	251,837	109,166
PERCENT OF ENROLLEES	100.0	47.2	37.7	10.5	4.6
PERCENT MALE	52.6	56.2	48.6	51.8	49.2

	HISPANIC GROUP			
	<u>ALL HISPANICS^c</u>	<u>CHICANO</u>	<u>PUERTO RICANS</u>	<u>OTHERS^d</u>
ESTIMATED NUMBER	251,839	144,549	56,509	50,781
PERCENT OF ENROLLEES	100.0	57.4	22.4	20.2
PERCENT MALE	51.8	50.1	53.1	55.3

^a Estimated number is projected from CLMS sample size.

^b Expressed in millions, all other figures are actual numerical value.

^c Total is for all Hispanics, numbers vary by two from Hispanic in race group because of missing values and sampling weight.

^d Others include Cubans, Central-South Americans, and others of Spanish origin. Cubans represented 3.2 percent of the Hispanic enrollees; Central-South Americans, 6.1 percent; and other Spanish origin, 11 percent. For purpose of this study, they are classified into one category.

Source: CLMS, Special Tabulation, September 1979.

TABLE 13
CETA ENROLLEES IN ADULT AND YOUTH PROGRAMS
BY RACE AND HISPANIC GROUP, FY 1978

RACE GROUP				
<u>PROGRAM TYPE</u> (Percentage)	<u>TOTAL</u> ^a	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANICS</u>
ADULT PROGRAMS ^b	48.1	58.8	36.4	43.5
YOUTH PROGRAMS ^c	51.9	41.2	63.6	56.5

HISPANIC GROUP				
<u>PROGRAM TYPE</u> (Percentage)	<u>ALL HISPANICS</u>	<u>CHICANO</u>	<u>PUERTO RICAN</u>	<u>OTHERS</u>
ADULT PROGRAMS	43.5	41.5	43.5	49.5
YOUTH PROGRAMS	56.6	58.5	56.6	50.5

^a Total includes other races. A separate category for other races is not presented.

^b Adult programs are classroom training, on-the-job training, adult work experience, public service employment, direct referrals, no initial program assignment, and skills training and improvement programs.

^c Youth programs are summer youth, youth work experience, youth employment and training, and youth community conservation and improvement projects.

Source: CLMS, Special Tabulation, September 1979

TABLE 14
CETA ADULT PROGRAMS BY RACE, FY 1978

RACE GROUP				
ADULT TYPE PROGRAM (Percent Distribution)	TOTAL ^a	WHITE	BLACK	HISPANIC
CLASSROOM TRAINING	22.6	19.7	24.8	29.3
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING	10.6	12.4	6.9	11.4
DIRECT REFERRAL	7.3	6.8	7.9	8.7
ADULT WORK EXPERIENCE	6.7	6.7	6.5	6.0
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT SUSTAINED	22.7	25.4	18.8	20.3
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT	25.4	25.5	29.1	17.6
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT UNKNOWN	.2	.2	.2	.0
NO ASSIGNMENT	3.2	2.2	4.6	5.5
SKILLS TRAINING AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1
TOTAL NUMBER	1,150,798 ^b	663,898	329,447	109,773
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES	100.0 ^a	57.7	28.6	9.5

^a Total includes other races. Separate category for the 4,768 persons of other races is not presented.

^b Total enrollees excludes 781 missing observations.

Source: CLMS, Special Tabulation, September 1979

TABLE 15

CETA ADULT PROGRAMS BY HISPANIC GROUP, FY 1978

ADULT TYPE PROGRAM (Percent Distribution)	HISPANIC GROUP			
	<u>ALL HISPANICS</u>	<u>CHICANO</u>	<u>PUERTO RICANS</u>	<u>OTHERS^a</u>
CLASSROOM TRAINING	29.3	30.7	23.0	31.9
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING	11.4	12.0	12.4	8.8
DIRECT REFERRALS	8.7	5.4	14.5	11.0
ADULT WORK EXPERIENCE	6.0	6.5	6.0	4.9
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT SUSTAINED	20.3	24.6	8.8	21.6
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROJECT	17.6	15.3	25.8	15.0
PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT UNKNOWN	.0	.0	.0	.0
NO ASSIGNMENT	5.5	4.3 ^c	8.7	5.4
SKILLS TRAINING AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1.1	1.2	.8	1.5
TOTAL NUMBER	109,773 ^b	59,989	24,640	25,145
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES	100.0	54.6	22.4	22.9

^a Others includes Cuban, Central-South Americans, and other Spanish origin.

^b Total number does not equal sub-totals due to sampling error. There is a difference of one.

TABLE 16
CETA YOUTH PROGRAMS BY RACE, FY 1978

<u>YOUTH TYPE PROGRAM^a</u> (Percent Distribution)	<u>RACE GROUP</u>			
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM	68.3	59.4	74.3	69.5
YWE	13.8	18.7	10.6	11.8
YCCIP	2.5	3.1	1.9	3.3
YETP-CT	2.7	3.1	2.5	2.5
YETP-OJT	.6	.7	.5	.7
YETP-YWE	11.0	13.7	9.1	10.7
YETP-UNKNOWN	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.5
TOTAL NUMBER	1,240,856 ^b	464,364	572,943	142,064
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES	100.0	37.4	46.2	11.4

^a In addition to summer programs, the names of the youth programs are as follows: Youth Work Experience (YWE); Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Project (YCCIP); and Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP): classroom training, on-the-job training, youth work experience, and unknown.

^b Total enrollees in youth programs includes other races. No separate category is provided. Total enrollees excludes 1,303 missing observations.

TABLE 17
CETA YOUTH PROGRAMS BY HISPANIC GROUP, FY 1978

YOUTH TYPE PROGRAM ^a	HISPANIC GROUP			
	ALL HISPANICS	CHICANO	PUERTO RICANS	OTHERS ^b
(Percent Distribution)	69.5	64.1	77.1	78.0
SUMMER	69.5	64.1	77.1	78.0
YWE	11.8	15.9	5.5	6.3
YCCIP	3.3	4.2	2.3	1.7
YETP-CT	2.5	2.9	2.2	1.4
YETP-OJT	.7	.5	.5	1.6
YETP-YWE	10.7	11.0	10.4	10.1
YETP-UNKNOWN	1.5	1.5	2.0	.9
TOTAL NUMBER	142,065	84,560	31,869	25,636
PERCENT OF ALL EMROLLTES	100.0	59.5	22.4	18.0

^a In addition to summer youth programs, the names of the youth programs are as follows: Youth Work Experience (YWE), Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Project (YCCIP); and Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP): classroom training, on-the-job training, youth work experience, and unknown.

^b Others includes Cubans, Central-South Americans and other Spanish origin.

TABLE 18
SELECTED COMPARISON OF ENROLLEES IN CETA
ADULT PROGRAMS BY RACE, FY 1978

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
ESTIMATED ENROLLEES	663,898	329,447	109,773
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES ^a	57.7	28.6	9.5
PERCENT MALE	(663,796) ^b 57.3	(329,356) 51.3	(109,772) 55.2
AGE DISTRIBUTION	(662,958)	(329,421)	(109,770)
Under 18 yrs.	2.8	2.7	1.1
18-21	25.0	28.6	15.5
22-29	38.3	40.7	44.4
30-44	21.3	20.1	29.5
45-54	7.4	5.3	6.1
55 and over	5.2	2.6	3.5
EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION	(659,858)	(327,729)	(108,805)
8 yrs. and under	7.6	6.5	15.6
9-11	19.3	27.0	28.0
High School or Equiv.	43.9	43.6	37.6
Post High School	29.2	22.9	18.8
PERCENT NOT VETERAN	(659,268) 77.2	(326,234) 83.8	(109,296) 88.4
FAMILY SIZE	(663,730)	(329,423)	(109,772)
Under 2 persons	43.3	33.2	31.6
3-6	51.8	53.3	57.6
7 or more	4.9	13.5	10.9

TABLE 18-2

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
FAMILY INCOME AT ENTRY	(629,546)	(311,786)	(104,013)
Under \$2,999	22.9	30.8	24.5
3,000-4,999	19.6	23.0	22.4
5,000-7,499	17.9	19.0	21.2
7,500-11,999	17.8	16.0	18.6
12,000-14,999	6.9	4.9	5.3
15,000 and over	15.0	6.3	8.0
ENROLLEE EARNINGS, YEAR PRIOR TO ENTRY	(614,808)	(309,187)	(102,304)
Under \$1,000	41.5	52.3	45.8
1,000-2,999	23.6	21.1	22.2
3,000-5,999	22.5	18.5	21.0
6,000-9,999	10.0	6.8	9.2
10,000 and over	2.5	1.3	1.8
DEPENDENTS	(663,825)	(329,421)	(109,772)
0	58.6	46.4	49.8
1	16.2	20.2	13.8
2-3	19.6	24.8	25.5
4-5	4.5	6.7	8.4
6 and over	1.1	2.0	2.5
LOWER LIVING STANDARD^c			
Below 85% (Yes)	(654,261) 73.8	(327,458) 86.3	(109,408) 83.3
Below 100% (Yes)	(654,261) 78.5	(327,454) 89.9	(109,404) 88.6
Receiving Public Benefits^d	(632,641) 20.3	(314,114) 42.6	(104,677) 29.8

TABLE 18-3

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED ^c (Yes)	(607,109) 66.7	(306,695) 80.1	(102,068) 72.5
LABOR FORCE STATUS AT ENTRY	(663,775)	(329,418)	(109,772)
Employed	23.3	21.9	20.2
In school employed	1.0	0.9	0.7
Unemployed	52.1	54.4	51.6
School/Training	8.4	11.7	11.0
Armed Forces	0.3	0.3	0.1
Other NILF	14.9	10.7	16.5
DOMINANT LFS, PRE-ENTRY YEAR	(660,856)	(328,266)	(109,678)
Employed GE 90%	10.3	8.8	10.2
Unemployed GE 50%	31.9	41.3	31.4
NILF GE 50%	28.7	28.5	32.0
ENGLISH BARRIER (Yes)	(662,775) 1.0	(329,372) 0.6	(109,760) 17.4
HOW INFORMED OF CETA	(663,101)	(328,115)	(109,186)
Transfer	0.8	1.3	1.6
Friend	29.5	38.6	36.8
Relative	9.4	11.0	14.9
School	4.6	4.4	4.9
State Employment Service	24.6	20.3	17.0
Media	9.7	7.3	6.4
Welfare	1.2	4.3	4.5
Other	8.6	8.6	9.3
Other Employment Services	8.5	4.2	4.7

TABLE 18-4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	RACE GROUP		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
CETA GOALS	(662,454)	(328,145)	(109,064)
Wanted a Job	72.3	70.6	62.3
Wanted Job Training	18.2	22.0	24.4
Wanted Better Job	1.8	1.6	2.2
Income	1.5	1.0	0.8
H.S. Diploma	2.3	3.2	3.6
Remedial/Basic ED	0.2	0.2	0.6
English Instruction	0.1	0.0	4.1
Other	3.6	1.3	2.0

^a Percent of all enrollees is based on total number of enrollees that includes persons of other races. No separate category for other races is presented.

^b Number in parenthesis refers to the number of observations the distribution within characteristics is derived. Discrepancies in observations among characteristics are due to missing values.

^c Income level established by Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1978, it was \$11,546 to a non-farm family of four.

^d Any type of public benefit includes, AFDC, SSI, food stamps, public housing and other benefits.

^e Economically Disadvantaged means an enrollee is a member of a family that receives cash welfare, or family income in relation to size and location, does not exceed established poverty levels. In 1978, it was \$6,200 for a non-farm family of four.

TABLE 19

SELECTED COMPARISON OF ENROLLEES IN CETA ADULT
PROGRAM BY HISPANIC GROUP, FY 1978

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	HISPANIC GROUP			
	ALL HISPANICS	CHICANO	PUERTO RICANS	OTHERS ^a
ESTIMATED ENROLLEES	109,773	59,989	24,640	25,145
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES	100	54.6	22.4	22.9
PERCENT MALE	(109,773) ^b 55.2	(59,989) 55.6	(24,640) 55.7	(25,144) 53.6
AGE DISTRIBUTION	(109,773)	(59,989)	(24,640)	(25,145)
Under 18	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7
18-21	28.6	30.9	28.2	23.4
22-29	38.8	37.9	38.8	41.0
30-44	21.9	21.1	25.6	20.3
45-54	5.5	5.3	3.4	8.1
55 and over	2.5	2.2	1.4	4.4
EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION	(108,806)	(59,918)	(23,975)	(24,914)
8 yrs. and under	15.6	18.5	13.4	10.9
9-11	28.0	29.4	32.6	20.0
High School or Equiv.	37.6	35.9	36.6	42.8
Post High School	18.8	16.2	17.4	26.3
PERCENT NOT VETERAN	(109,312) 88.4	(59,860) 86.8	(24,362) 92.0	(25,090) 88.8
FAMILY SIZE	(109,773)	(59,989)	(24,640)	(25,145)
Under 2 persons	31.6	27.9	34.1	37.9
3-6	57.6	57.7	59.4	55.5
7 and over	10.9	14.5	6.5	6.5

TABLE 19-2

HISPANIC GROUP				
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	ALL HISPANIC	CHICANO	PUERTO RICANS	OTHERS ^a
FAMILY INCOME AT ENTRY	(104,014)	(59,860)	(24,362)	(25,090)
Under \$2,999	24.5	22.3	29.0	25.0
3,000-4,999	22.4	23.2	21.0	21.9
5,000-7,499	21.2	22.6	18.9	20.7
7,500-11,999	18.6	18.5	18.2	18.2
12,000-14,999	5.3	5.8	3.9	5.3
15,000 and over	8.0	7.4	9.0	8.3
ENROLLEE EARNINGS YEAR PRIOR TO ENTRY	(102,305)	(55,273)	(23,464)	(23,565)
Under \$1,000	45.8	42.1	56.7	43.8
1,000-2,999	22.2	22.1	20.0	24.5
3,000-5,999	21.0	23.9	15.5	19.5
6,000-9,999	9.2	10.4	5.8	10.2
10,000 and over	1.8	1.5	1.9	2.1
DEPENDENTS	(109,773)	(59,989)	(24,640)	(25,145)
0	49.8	48.1	49.5	54.2
1	13.8	12.9	15.7	14.2
2-3	25.5	26.9	25.8	22.1
4-5	8.4	8.9	7.6	8.0
6 and over	2.5	3.3	1.4	1.5
LOWER LIVING STANDARD ^c				
Below 85% (Yes)	(109,421) 83.3	(59,894) 84.8	(24,640) 82.4	(24,887) 80.8
Below 100% (Yes)	(109,421) 88.6	(54,984) 90.1	(24,640) 87.9	(24,887) 85.8

TABLE 19-3

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	HISPANIC GROUP			
	ALL HISPANICS	CHICANO	PUERTO RICANS	OTHERS ^a
RECEIVING PUBLIC BENEFITS (Yes)	(104,682) 29.8	(57,845) 29.3	(22,706) 38.1	(24,131) 23.1
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED ^e (Yes)	(102,074) 72.5	(56,761) 73.8	(22,456) 70.8	(22,856) 71.0
LABOR FORCE STATUS AT ENTRY	(109,773)	(59,989)	(24,640)	(25,145)
Employed	20.2	21.4	16.9	20.4
In School Employed	0.7	0.7	0.2	1.0
Unemployed	51.6	49.3	56.6	52.3
School/Training	11.0	10.8	12.2	10.2
Armed Forces	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2
Other NILF	16.5	17.6	14.2	15.9
DOMINANT LFS PRE-ENTRY YEAR	(109,079)	(59,628)	(24,479)	(24,973)
Employed GE 90%	10.2	11.6	6.8	10.5
Unemployed GE 50%	31.4	26.8	44.3	29.8
NILF GE 50%	32.0	33.8	28.1	31.5
Other	26.4	27.8	20.9	28.2
ENGLISH BARRIER (Yes)	(109,733) 17.4	(59,989) 13.3	(24,640) 23.4	(25,144) 21.5
HOW INFORMED OF CETA	(109,187)	(59,911)	(24,181)	(25,095)
Transfer	1.6	1.4	3.3	2.2
Friend	36.8	34.9	59.6	38.8
Relative	14.9	15.9	5.0	12.5
School	4.9	5.1	8.6	5.0
State Employment Service	17.0	18.6	7.8	20.1
Media	6.4	6.4	9.2	5.7

TABLE 19-4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	HISPANIC GROUP			
	ALL HISPANICS	CHICANO	PUERTO RICANS	OTHERS ^a
Welfare	4.5	4.1	2.3	2.6
Other	9.3	8.2	2.5	10.2
Other Employment Services	4.7	5.5	1.7	2.8
CETA GOALS	(109,066)	(59,911)	(24,060)	(25,095)
Wanted a Job	62.3	62.2	66.3	58.7
Wanted Job Training	24.4	25.1	22.4	24.6
Wanted Better Job	2.2	2.4	1.4	2.7
Income	0.8	0.4	0.3	1.9
H.S. Diploma	3.6	4.9	2.3	1.8
Remedial Basic ED	0.6	0.6	0.3	1.0
English Instruction	4.1	2.8	4.3	7.0
Other	2.0	1.7	2.6	2.3

^a Others include Cuban, Central-South Americans, and other Spanish origin.

^b Number in parenthesis refers to the number of observations the distribution within characteristics is derived. Discrepancies in observations among characteristics are due to missing values.

^c Income level established by Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1978, it was \$11,546 to a non-farm family of four.

^d Any type of public benefit includes AFDC, SSI, food stamps, public housing and other benefits.

^e Economically disadvantaged means an enrollee is a member of a family that receives cash welfare, or family income in relation to size and location, does not exceed established poverty levels. In 1978, it was \$6,200 for a non-farm family of four.

TABLE 20
SELECTED COMPARISON OF ENROLLEES IN CETA YOUTH
PROGRAMS BY RACE, FY 1978

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	RACE GROUP		
	WHITE	BLACK	HISPANIC
ESTIMATED ENROLLEES	464,364	572,943	142,064
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES ^a	37.4	46.2	11.4
PERCENT MALE	(464,334) ^b 54.7	(572,921) 47.1	(142,064) 49.2
AGE DISTRIBUTION	(464,334)	(572,924)	(142,063)
Under 18 yrs.	74.4	72.2	74.2
18-21	24.9	27.1	25.7
22-29	0.7	0.2	0.1
30-44	0.1	0.3	0.0
45-54	0.0	0.2	0.0
55+	-	-	-
EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION	(461,230)	(567,249)	(142,064)
8 yrs. and Under	21.2	13.6	24.0
9-11	59.9	66.3	59.2
High School or Equiv.	14.1	15.5	13.1
Post High School	4.7	4.6	3.8
PERCENT NOT VETERAN	(464,089) 98.9	(572,916) 98.8	(142,061) 99.5
FAMILY SIZE	(464,280)	(572,926)	(142,064)
Under 2 Persons	17.5	10.3	8.3
3-6	59.7	57.7	58.7
7 or More	22.7	32.1	33.0

TABLE 20-2

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
FAMILY INCOME AT ENTRY	(419,372)	(511,993)	(132,668)
Under \$2,999	15.8	15.7	10.7
3000-4,999	17.6	25.5	22.6
5000-7,499	23.7	24.6	27.7
7,500-11,999	24.1	21.4	23.6
12,000-14,999	7.6	7.0	10.7
15,000 and Over	11.2	6.0	4.6
ENROLLEE EARNINGS, YEAR PRIOR TO ENTRY	(448,469)	(550,411)	(139,195)
Under \$1,000	78.4	85.4	83.6
1,000-2,999	16.3	11.9	11.7
3,000-5,999	4.7	2.4	2.9
6,000-9,999	0.4	0.3	1.7
10,000 and Over	0.1	0.0	0.1
DEPENDENTS	(464,257)	(572,923)	(142,062)
0	95.9	90.0	93.0
1	3.1	7.9	4.6
2-3	0.9	1.9	2.2
4-5	0.0	0.2	0.1
6 and Over	0.0	0.0	0.2
LOWER LIVING STANDARD^c			
Below 85% (Yes)	(459,040) 83.6	(567,062) 90.4	(141,739) 95.2
Below 100% (Yes)	(459,037) 88.4	(567,060) 94.6	(141,739) 96.9
RECEIVING PUBLIC BENEFITS^d	(446,120)	(545,005)	(136,855)
(Yes)	38.0	55.4	49.7

TABLE 20-3

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED ^e (Yes)	(403,602) 73.5	(509,503) 84.5	(131,824) 83.5
LABOR FORCE STATUS AT ENTRY	(464,320)	(572,858)	(142,065)
Employed	15.8	15.4	13.7
In School Employed	4.6	2.4	3.2
Unemployed	34.7	38.9	26.3
School/Training	31.7	35.1	37.4
Armed Forces	0.0	0.0	0.1
Other NILF	13.2	8.2	19.4
DOMINANT LFS, PRE-ENTRY YEAR	(463,667)	(571,767)	(141,989)
Employed GE 90%	1.2	1.5	1.5
Unemployed GE 50%	6.8	7.5	4.9
NILF GE 50%	84.2	87.4	87.2
ENGLISH BARRIER (Yes)	(464,251) 1.0	(572,916) 1.0	(142,061) 5.4
HOW INFORMED OF CETA	(463,386)	(510,905)	(141,926)
Transfer	0.4	0.7	0.2
Friend	22.9	28.9	30.9
Relative	20.3	12.3	25.5
School	37.8	44.6	32.3
State Employment Service	4.2	2.7	2.6
Media	3.5	2.9	0.5
Welfare	2.9	0.9	1.2
Other	6.3	6.1	5.0
Other Employment Service	1.7	0.9	1.7
CETA GOALS	(463,400)	(572,380)	(142,062)
Wanted a Job	86.1	88.7	80.9
Wanted Job Training	7.5	7.5	14.4

TABLE 20-4

<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>RACE GROUP</u>		
	<u>WHITE</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>HISPANIC</u>
Wanted Better Job	0.2	0.7	0.9
Income	3.5	1.1	1.0
H.S. Diploma	1.7	0.8	0.6
Remedial/Basic ED	0.0	0.2	0.8
English Instruction	0.0	0.0	0.1
Other	1.0	1.0	1.2

^a Percent of all enrollees is based on total number of enrollees that includes persons of other races. No separate category for other races is presented.

^b Number in parenthesis refers to the number of observations the distribution within characteristics is derived. Discrepancies in observations among characteristics are due to missing values.

^c Income level established by Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1978, it was \$11,544 for a non-farm family of four.

^d Any type of public benefit includes AFDC, SSI, food stamps, public housing and other benefits.

^e Economically disadvantaged means an enrollee is a member of a family that receives cash welfare, or family income in relation to size and location, does not exceed established poverty levels. In 1978, it was \$6,200 for a non-farm family of four.

TABLE 21
SELECTED COMPARISON OF ENROLLEES IN CETA YOUTH
PROGRAMS BY HISPANIC GROUP, FY 1978

HISPANIC GROUP				
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	ALL HISPANICS	CHICANO	PUERTO RICAN	OTHERS ^a
ESTIMATED ENROLLEES	(142,065)	(84,560)	(31,869)	(25,636)
PERCENT OF ALL ENROLLEES	100	59.5	22.4	18.1
PERCENT MALE	(142,065) ^b 49.2	(84,560) 46.2	(31,869) 51.1	(25,636) 56.9
AGE DISTRIBUTION	(142,065)	(84,560)	(31,869)	(25,636)
Under 18 yrs.	74.2	70.6	91.8	64.3
18-21	25.07	29.3	8.2	35.7
22-29	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-44	-	-	-	-
45-54	-	-	-	-
55 and Over	-	-	-	-
EDUCATION DISTRIBUTION	(142,065)	(84,560)	(31,869)	(25,636)
8 yrs. and Under	24.0	18.7	46.7	13.1
9-11	59.2	68.3	36.9	56.7
High School or Equiv.	13.1	8.5	15.3	25.5
Post High School	3.8	4.5	1.0	4.7
PERCENT NOT VETERAN	(142,064) 99.5	(84,559) 99.3	(31,869) 99.7	(25,636) 100
FAMILY SIZE	(142,065)	(84,560)	(31,869)	(25,636)
Under 2 Persons	8.3	6.9	13.6	6.2
3-6	58.7	55.1	73.6	52.3
7 or More	33.0	38.0	12.8	41.5

TABLE 21-2

HISPANIC GROUP				
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	ALL HISPANIC	CHICANO	PUERTO RICAN	OTHERS ^a
FAMILY INCOME AT ENTRY	(132,668)	(78,237)	(30,376)	(24,054)
Under \$2,999	10.7	12.0	6.2	12.7
3,000-4,999	22.6	21.1	32.3	15.8
5,000-7,499	27.7	31.5	30.8	11.7
7,500-11,999	23.6	14.0	25.8	51.9
12,000-14,999	10.7	15.6	1.6	6.5
15,000 and Over	4.6	5.9	2.0	1.4
ENROLLEE EARNINGS, YEAR PRIOR TO ENTRY	(139,197)	(82,336)	(31,603)	(25,258)
Under \$1,000	83.6	76.5	96.1	91.4
1,000-2,999	11.7	16.2	3.6	7.1
3,000-5,999	2.9	4.5	0.4	0.7
6,000-9,999	1.7	2.7	0.0	0.8
10,000 and Over	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
DEPENDENTS	(142,064)	(84,559)	(31,869)	(25,636)
0	93.0	91.0	97.7	93.6
1	4.6	5.5	1.2	5.9
2-3	2.2	3.1	0.9	0.6
4-5	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0
6 and Over	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0
LOWER LIVING STANDARD ^c				
Below 85% (Yes)	(141,742) 95.2	(84,308) 95.6	(31,798) 97.9	(25,636) 90.4
Below 100% (Yes)	(141,742) 96.9	(84,308) 96.6	(31,798) 99.8	(25,636) 94.4
RECEIVING PUBLIC BENEFITS ^d (Yes)	(136,856) 49.7	(80,779) 42.0	(31,526) 69.7	(24,551) 49.2

TABLE 21-3

HISPANIC GROUP				
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS	ALL HISPANIC	CHICANO	PUERTO RICAN	OTHERS ^a
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (Yes)	(136,856) 83.5	(76,754) 81.4	(31,378) 92.7	(23,694) 78.3
LABOR FORCE STATUS AT ENTRY	(142,065)	(84,560)	(31,869)	(25,636)
Employed	13.7	18.6	4.7	8.5
In School Employed	3.2	3.9	2.1	2.3
Unemployed	26.3	26.1	17.2	38.0
School/Training	37.4	36.3	50.0	25.0
Armed Forces	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Other NILF	19.4	15.0	25.9	26.1
DOMINANT LFS, PRE-ENTRY YEAR	(141,992)	(84,559)	(31,796)	(25,636)
Employed GE 90%	1.5	2.3	0.2	0.5
Unemployed GE 50%	4.9	6.1	1.6	5.0
NILF GE 50%	87.2	83.3	96.9	87.9
Other	6.4	8.3	1.3	6.6
ENGLISH BARRIER (Yes)	(142,064) 5.4	(84,559) 6.4	(31,869) 3.1	(25,636) 4.9
HOW INFORMED OF CETA Transfer	(141,926) 0.2	(84,488) 0.3	(31,869) 0.2	(25,569) 0.0
Friend	30.9	33.8	13.2	43.5
Relative	25.5	21.3	38.4	23.3
School	32.3	33.3	38.8	21.3
State Employment Service	2.6	2.2	0.9	6.0
Media	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.0
Welfare	1.2	0.8	2.7	0.4
Other	5.0	7.2	2.0	1.8
Other Employment Service	1.7	0.4	3.4	3.8

TABLE 21-4

HISPANIC GROUP				
<u>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>ALL HISPANICS</u>	<u>CHICANO</u>	<u>PUERTO RICAN</u>	<u>OTHERS^a</u>
CETA GOALS	(142,065)	(84,559)	(31,869)	(25,636)
Wanted a Job	80.9	75.4	86.9	91.9
Wanted Job Training	14.4	19.0	8.2	7.0
Wanted Better Job	0.9	1.4	0.0	0.3
Income	1.0	1.5	0.2	0.0
H.S. Diploma	0.6	1.0	0.2	0.0
Remedial Basic ED	0.8	0.2	3.3	0.0
English Instruction	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3
Other	1.2	1.6	0.9	5.5

^a Others include Cubans, Central-South Americans, and other Spanish origin.

^b Number in parenthesis refers to the number of observations the distribution within characteristics is derived. Discrepancies in observations among characteristics are due to missing values.

^c Income level established by Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1978, it was \$11,546 for a non-farm family of four.

^d Any type of public benefit includes AFDC, SSI, food stamps, public housing and other benefits.

^e Economically disadvantaged means an enrollee is member of a family that receives cash welfare, or family income in relation to size and location does not exceed established poverty levels. In 1978, it was \$6,200 for a non-farm family of four.

TABLE 22
 DISTRIBUTION OF TERMINEES OUT AT LEAST 3 MONTHS BY
 LABOR STATUS, 1 MONTH PRIOR TO ENTRY AND 3 MONTHS
 AFTER TERMINATION, FISCAL YEAR 1976

	WHITES (247,800)			BLACKS (110,400)			HISPANICS (45,000)		
	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL
1 MONTH BEFORE ENTRY	27	48	25	22	54	24	26	46	28
3 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION	59	21	20	46	34	20	54	26	20
CHANGE	+32	-27	-5	+24	-20	-4	+28	-20	-8

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration

CLMS Follow-Up Report No. 2, November 1979

TABLE 23

TABLE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF CETA TERMINEES ENROLLED JULY, 1975
THROUGH JUNE, 1976 BY LABOR FORCE STATUS AND RACE

	WHITES			BLACKS			HISPANICS		
	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	NOT IN LABOR POOL
1 MONTH BEFORE ENTRY	28	47	25	21	53	26	26	45	29
3 MONTHS AFTER TERMINATION	64	17	19	50	30	20	60	22	18
CHANGE	+36	-30	-6	+29	-23	-6	+34	-23	-9

SOURCE: Employment and Training Administration

CLMS Follow-Up Report No. 2, November 1979

TABLE 24

Average hourly wages for those who worked
at least 12 months: Enrolled July 75-June 76

	<u>Minority Status</u>		
	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
<u>Prior to Entry</u>			
1-3 months	\$3.14	\$3.05	\$2.98
<u>After Termination</u>			
1-3 months	3.37	3.25	3.13
10-12 months	3.88	3.59	3.57
<u>Increase in Wages</u>			
1-3 months	.23	.20	.15
10-12 months	.74	.54	.59

Source: CLMS Follow-Up Report No. 2, November 1979
Table 66

TABLE 25

Absolute and proportional changes in annualized earnings between the fourth quarter prior to entry and the fourth quarter after termination: CETA terminees out at least 12 months enrolled during July 1975 through June 1976.

	Time Period		Change	
	12 to 10 Months Prior to Entry	10 to 12 Months Post- termination	Change in (dollars)	Percent Change
Minority Status				
White (excluding Hispanic)	3,140	5,570	+2,430	+78
Black	2,240	3,890	+1,650	+74
Hispanic	2,660	4,740	+2,080	+78
Other	2,770	4,970	+2,200	+80

Source: CLMS Follow-Up Report No. 2, November 1979. Table 69

RESEARCH ON HISPANICS IN THE LABOR MARKET

Walter Fogel*

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines recent research on Hispanic labor market experience in the United States and matters related to that experience. In some sense nearly everything about a population group is ultimately connected to how it does in the job market. But in order to keep my task both manageable and clearly focused, I defined my field of investigation to include only research which was rather directly connected to contemporary employment experience. Consequently, a good deal of interesting Hispanic research, particularly that dealing with schooling and family behavior, fall outside of my boundaries, unless the findings had evident implications for job experience.

Terminological clarity for designating the population group under consideration and its sub-groups does not exist. I shall use the term "Hispanic" to refer to this population, but the alternatives "Spanish origin" or "Spanish American" would do just as well. Most Hispanic research does not deal with the total Hispanic population, rather with one or more ethnic components of it. The component groups identifiable in the research are Mexican American (or Chicano), Puerto Rican, Cuban, and, sometimes, Central and South American. These sub-groups, rather than the total Hispanic population, are the usual foci of research because they tend to reside in different regions of the United States, and because they trace their origins to different countries or territories of the Western Hemisphere. The commonality of the component groups, Spanish language heritage, is rather weak certainly not strong enough to produce similarity of experience among the different groups. Then, perhaps the chief reasons for lumping them together under the label Hispanic are for the convenience of governmental and other institutions, including the media, and for the mobilization of political power. Whether these are adequate justifications for a practice which also produces misconceptions and some misdirection of policy is a question which I will not attempt to answer.

*Dr. Walter Fogel is Professor in the Graduate School of Management at The University of California at Los Angeles.

Research support for this paper was provided by the Department of Labor through the University of Texas at San Antonio Institutional Grant Program (No. 31-48-78-08).

The time focus of the research examined is principally the 1970s, a decade in which Hispanic oriented inquiry must have multiplied several fold. Because of time constraints, not all relevant research could be examined, but I believe that very few important findings have been missed. The research covered, for the most part, includes only that which has been published for general circulation, on the grounds that significant advances in knowledge nearly always occur in that form. This paper examines characteristics of the research, categorizes it, summarizes knowledge within the categories, and assesses the existing state of knowledge.

WHO DOES THE RESEARCH

There are three kinds of researchers in the Hispanic arena, as well as in other areas of investigation. One of these is the government employee who conducts and reports research as part of his or her job for an agency which collects information on Hispanics--the Bureau of Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for example. This research usually presents and discusses factual information from data recently collected by the employing agency. The mode of reporting tends to be descriptive rather than analytic, severely bounded by direct interpretation of the survey data, and extremely cautious in attributing causation for the facts presented.¹ Nonetheless, much of the research is useful for communicating basic and reliable factual knowledge to a wide audience and, consequently, for stimulating additional research. Government employees also produce Hispanic research on the *ad hoc* basis for special topics (Interagency Task Force on Immigration Policy) or a special agency (United States Commission on Civil Rights). The quality and usefulness of this work vary greatly.

A second kind of researcher, fairly prominent in the Hispanic field, is the nonacademic government contractor. Consulting and contracting firms, community agencies, and employment and training units of local government, are the most important of these. Contract research is usually initiated by request-for-proposals on a specific research topic from government agencies, with the contract awarded to the proposal most likely to answer reliably and validly the research question posed. Naturally, the procedure places a premium on good proposal writing which may or may not be followed by good research. This makes it necessary for the funding agency to be able to identify those contractors who do good research as well as good proposals. Some agencies do this well; others do not.

Another problem with contract research is that the funding agency may not be able to state the research problem competently because of the absence of, or the agency's lack of access to, necessary theoretical and empirical knowledge. In such cases, the contractor may be relied upon to state properly the research question, but his ability to do so, then, cannot be well judged by the funding agency.

These problems are particularly acute with respect to Hispanics

in the labor market because few contractors are adequately prepared to deal with that subject and because the background of theory and empirical knowledge for it is weak. As a consequence, the quality of contractor research on Hispanics covers the full range from worthless to highly useful. Contract research can have the virtue of directing investigation to the areas of greatest policy need. On the other hand, research, which is done for a price rather than because the researcher is deeply interested in answering certain questions, does produce a fair amount of sterile or perfunctory results. Sweat, tears, and, perhaps, a heartfelt commitment often precede significant advances in new knowledge. These are simply not forthcoming from all contractors, although many do perform competently on carefully stated, straightforward research tasks.

Contractor research has produced useful information and understanding. The Office of Research and Development of the Employment and Training Administration of 1977 awarded thirty-two development grants for Hispanic labor market research, divided among academic and contract researchers. Final reports for most of these grants have been submitted and were examined for this paper. While many of the results are useful additions to knowledge, the greater value of this program may have been its stimulation and support of research interest in Hispanics for the future, among private contractors, academics, and even community organizations.

The other kind of researcher in the Hispanic field is the academician. Most good quality research on Hispanics is done by academics, usually, but not always with the support of funding from outside sources in addition to that provided by their employing institutions. Much of the research is done by scholars whose main concern is Hispanics, but an increasing amount is being reported by academics whose major focus is a traditional social science subject, such as the labor market or equality of opportunity, and who include Hispanics and Blacks in their investigations and analyses. The latter kind of research has increased because of the greater availability of survey and census data for Hispanics and because of a heightened awareness of this population and its experiences. Research which starts from a strong base in one or more of the social science disciplines and then examines Hispanics tends to be better quality than that which arises chiefly out of an interest in Hispanics. Of course, it is possible and highly desirable to have both, but that combination is not yet common in Hispanic research. Additional comments on the quality of Hispanic research done by academics will be made in the following sections of this paper.

RESEARCH MODES

Several modes of research on Hispanics in the labor market can be identified.

1. Exposition of secondary data. This is the presentation and

discussion of descriptive facts, frequently based upon census and other government publications. As mentioned, it is often done by government researchers, but may also be done by academics as well. This research does have communication value, but it is not the best use of an academician's time, unless the descriptions are supplemented, at least by provocative hypotheses about causal forces which underlie the facts, if not actual analyses of these causal forces.

2. Survey collection of primary data--no analysis. These are often done by community based or local government organizations, directed at some more or less specific purpose. Frequently, they are directed at identification of a client population--getting to know them, in a sense. They often have major weaknesses with sample size and representativeness. Rarely do these efforts produce any generalizable knowledge, and they often duplicate facts otherwise available. But no doubt, they do provide more systematic information about localized Hispanic population groups than would otherwise exist.

3. Survey collection of primary data--with analysis. This mode is similar to the preceding one, but is carried out by a competent contractor or academician. Samples tend to be more adequate, and analyses of variable relationships are carried out. Clearly, this kind of research can be very valuable and unique when it includes questions which large government funded surveys will not touch. Yet, the primary data analysis for Hispanic research tends to be crude in terms of both methods and theory. This may be because so much of the researcher's time and energies are devoted to survey design and data collection and processing that little is left for analysis. In any event, secondary data analyses tend to be much more sophisticated.

4. Analysis of secondary data--causal relationships. This manner of investigation, carried out almost completely by academics, tends to be the most useful because it gets at the causes of observed behavior and outcomes. This is important, especially in the Hispanic field, for policy development and for decisions by individuals and private groups. Hispanic research in this mode increased greatly in the 1970s, from a base of zero in prior decades, as data from the census and large surveys became available. The potential power of this kind of research comes from its ability to deal precisely with a large number of variables involved in complex relationships. Useful results are not always obtained, however. Among the reasons for this are (1) mechanically derived multivariate relationships, without benefit of theory, which are then mistakenly identified as explanation; and (2) the use of theoretical models which are too narrow, in the sense that they make too many variables exogenous, for adequate understanding of the behavior purportedly explained. Still, much has been learned about Hispanics in the labor market from analyses of secondary data. And we can be hopeful that more will be learned as theories and data become more adequate to the tasks.

CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH

There are various ways to categorize the research which deals with Hispanics in the labor market. One way is a simple division into labor market outcomes and processes. By the former, I mean research which examines earnings, occupations, labor force participation rates, unemployment rates, etc., and attempts to explain the determinants of each of these outcomes and why they differ from the outcomes of other groups, usually Anglos. By labor market processes I refer to the activities and behaviors of workers and institutions which are directed toward labor market objectives.

Most of the research on Hispanics, as with other population groups, deals with outcomes, for the pragmatic reason that data availability is greatest for analysis of outcomes. The usual approach is to estimate an earnings equation which includes productivity (human capital) variables, such as schooling and work experience, and also controls for other earnings related influences like weeks worked, marital status, and region of employment. Sociologists tend to retain human capital variables in their equations and add, or estimate separately, the effects of socioeconomic background variables such as father's occupation and schooling and urban or rural place of birth. Few of these equations explain more than one-third of the variance in individual Hispanic earnings. Nonetheless, the same variables are used to estimate the proportion of earnings differences between Hispanics and Anglos which is due to human capital differences and the proportion due to residual discrimination. Analyses of the other outcomes tend to be similar in method and theory. Interestingly, the unexplained difference between Hispanic and Anglo female labor force participation rates can be viewed as a measure of the effect of Hispanic culture.

The research on Hispanic labor market processes tends to be much less theoretically and quantitatively rigorous than the outcome studies. Immigration is the most investigated process, and its analysis is obviously handicapped by the absence of reliable facts. Migrant worker behavior; job information sources and job search behavior; and the impact of culture on work aspirations, preparations, and achievements, are only slightly more accessible research topics. Surprisingly little research has been reported which deals with the influence of various institutions on Hispanic job experience. This generalization encompasses various school programs, the public employment service, CETA programs, SER, welfare programs, and employers.

Although I believe that the outcome-process bifurcation of Hispanic research provides useful understanding of the nature of that research, I will employ less general categories for purposes of summarizing the research which I have examined for this paper. The bulk of that research falls under two subjects: labor market payoffs and immigration. The other categories used are worker behavior, labor market intermediaries, farm workers, and employers.

LABOR MARKET PAYOFFS

Earnings Functions

The determinants of individual earnings are roughly similar for Hispanics and Anglos.² Years of schooling, work experience, marriage, and weeks worked, all have a positive influence for both. Residence in rural areas and in the South have negative effects.

There are some differences in earnings functions between the two groups, however. Returns to schooling and work experience are usually less for all Hispanic groups, at least until college graduation is achieved in the case of schooling. Some ambiguity of results exists on returns to schooling: One study found higher returns for Cubans and Central or South Americans than for Anglos,³ and another reported similar returns for Mexicans and all Whites.⁴ The negative effect of living in the South is much greater for Mexican Americans than for Anglos--forty percent of earnings compared to fifteen percent for Anglos in one study.⁵ This is undoubtedly a Texas phenomenon, resulting from some combination of greater labor market discrimination in Texas than elsewhere, and a concentration of Mexican Americans in the low wage Rio Grande Valley.

The net effect on earnings of having been raised in a home in which Spanish was spoken is a complex one because, among other reasons, certain associated earnings influences cannot be fully controlled. Thus, a Spanish mother tongue apparently does not have an adverse impact on the earnings of Cubans in Miami or Mexicans in Chicago.⁶ Generally, however, a Spanish mother tongue is associated with lower earnings--thirty-five percent lower than those of Spanish surname men whose mother tongue is English (when only men with U.S. born parents are compared).⁷ Since only seven percent of native born Spanish surname men in the Southwest have English as a mother tongue,⁸ it is clear that language background and facility play a very important part in the low earnings experience of Hispanics. This can be said quite confidently even though we have little knowledge of how language interacts with socioeconomic background, culture, and discrimination in the determination of those earnings.

Foreign birth has an adverse impact on Hispanic earnings only initially--that is, controlling for other factors, foreign born males match the earnings of native born males after 10-15 years in the U.S.⁹ Second generation Hispanics (native born of foreign born parents) have the same earnings experience as all second generation groups in the U.S.: their earnings exceed those of both their parents and third generation persons--the offspring of native born parents.¹⁰

Within a sociological framework, most of the Hispanic-Anglo earnings difference disappears when social background, schooling, occupation, and experience are controlled.¹¹ These variables give me some

trouble since (1) I am not certain of how social background is supposed to influence earnings and (2) controlling for occupation as well as schooling probably "overexplains" earnings (and, thereby, reduces the "discrimination" residual).

Little has been done on Hispanic earnings variation across regions, but it has been noticed that Mexican earnings are lowest in Texas and highest in Chicago and Detroit.¹² The latter areas have employed Hispanics in high wage manufacturing industries despite their relatively low schooling. This fact suggests a conclusion which is too often overlooked in an era which stresses human capital earnings functions. Frequently, employment in a high wage manual sector of the economy is a quicker route to high earnings than is advanced schooling.

Change in Earnings

The Hispanic to Anglo male earnings ratio rose from .63 to .66 during the 1960s due principally to relative gains for Puerto Ricans.¹³ Mexican Americans' relative incomes in the Southwest stayed the same, masking relative gains in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and a decline in California.¹⁴ On an age cohort basis, relative earnings of Hispanics did not improve in this decade, and actually declined in the younger ages.¹⁵ Modest gains for females did occur over the period.

Although there has been little analysis of Hispanic income change during the 1970s, a number of factual observations can be made based on the annual reports from the Current Population Survey.¹⁶ It should be kept in mind, however, that the CPS sample sizes for Hispanics are quite small, causing the data obtained to be subject to unusually large errors.

While the incomes of Hispanics relative to all Whites apparently increased in the early 1970s,¹⁷ the opposite was true for the longer period for which data are available--1970-1977. The change is, perhaps, best observed with median family incomes. The median income of all Spanish origin families relative to that for all Whites was .72 in 1970 and .68 in 1977. Within the Spanish origin group, Puerto Ricans had the worst experience; their relative family income fell from .59 to .48 over the seven year period. Although starting from a much higher level, "other Spanish origin" families--those who are Cuban, Central American, or South American--also experienced a sharp drop in income relative to all Whites: from .85 to .76. Mexican families, in contrast, had a relative family income of .70 at both the beginning and end of the period.

Declines in the relative incomes of both male and female Hispanics contributed to the fall in Hispanic relative family income. Puerto Rican women suffered a particularly sharp decline, although their median income was still above that of all White females in 1977.

Mexican women was the only Hispanic group to improve its income relative to its all White counterparts over the 1970s: from .73 in 1970 to .84 in 1977.

These data, of course, are not adjusted for any changes in earnings related characteristics, such as age, geography, schooling, and, in the case of family income, labor force participation of family members. Even so, it appears likely that the Hispanic earnings experience relative to all Whites has deteriorated in the 1970s. Two hypotheses come quickly to mind to explain that conclusion. The first is that a rapidly growing Hispanic labor force is being "crowded" into a rather fixed number of labor markets, in terms of geography, occupation, and industry. The second hypothesis is that the rather disastrous Puerto Rican experience in New York City during the 1970s accounts for much of the deterioration in Hispanic relative income.

Discrimination

Labor market discrimination is nearly always empirically assessed by adjusting minority group earnings or incomes for differences which exist in earnings characteristics between the minority group and the reference group, usually all Whites. This is an appropriate procedure, but problems for the measurement of discrimination arise because, first, the determinants of earnings in our society are not well measured, as illustrated by the fact that most earnings equations explain less than a third of the total variation in individual earnings, and, second, it is not possible to control for all earnings determinants, even those which we know about, across population groups. As a result of these and other difficulties, residual earnings differences between Hispanics and all Whites, that is, the portion of the earnings difference which is unexplained by measured earnings determinants, are not very good measures of discrimination against the former. But the facts that there are no satisfactory alternatives to this method and that it does produce some insight into the relative importance of labor market discrimination has resulted in a number of studies which use the method to get at discrimination against Hispanics. Unfortunately, it has produced a wide and conflicting variety of research results.

The estimates of the discrimination components of Hispanic-all White earnings differences range from ten to seventy-five percent.¹⁸ This wide range may be partially because the ten percent figure came from a small sample in one medium sized city. Yet, the range of estimates for national and regional estimates is also quite large. One study found that the percentages of Hispanic-Anglo 1969 male earnings differences left unexplained by differences in personal characteristics were 24 percent for Mexican Americans, 31 percent for Puerto Ricans, and 47 percent for Cubans.¹⁹ One of the authors of this research used the same data to publish another set of results which showed much larger residuals after adjustment for personal characteristics: 55 percent for Mexican Americans, 60 percent for Puerto

Ricans and 70 percent for Cubans.²⁰ Depending upon which results one prefers, it can be said that labor market discrimination is either a minor or major contributor to the low earnings of Hispanics.

Another scholar, working with Puerto Rican (and Black) males in the New York SMSA, made a further adjustment for personal characteristics differences by using the cognitive achievement scores reported in the Coleman Report.²¹ This procedure reduced total discrimination against Puerto Rican males to very low levels and caused it to be completely eliminated in all occupations except manager, sales, and craft. The procedure is of doubtful validity, however, because we know little about the extent to which cognitive skills pay off in earnings for the work force in general.

There is also a conflict in the research on whether discrimination against Hispanics increased or decreased in the 1960s. One study reported a decline in the fraction of Hispanic-Anglo earnings differences not explained by personal characteristics, i.e., a decline in discrimination.²² But two other studies reported that, for Mexican Americans, the unexplained residual, that is, discrimination, increased over the decade.²³ I have previously suggested that the apparent relative importance of discrimination to Hispanic earnings will increase in the future as the Hispanic-Anglo schooling gap closes more rapidly than the earnings gap.²⁴ But rather than an increase in discrimination, this event would simply reflect the facts that earnings increases lag behind schooling increases in our society and that higher earnings sometimes bring about more schooling, rather than the reverse.

Given the available methods and data, we simply are not going to be able to measure discrimination against Hispanics (or anyone else) very confidently, at least at the macro level. Micro research on small samples with more complete information on earnings functions may be more useful.

Discrimination against Hispanics has been shown to be most severe in the manager and sales occupations, where majority "tastes" have their greatest influence, and least severe, if not nonexistent, among laborers, service workers, and operatives.²⁵ It is evident, in fact, that many employers prefer Hispanics for a number of manual occupations, some of them fairly well paying ones. These preferences result partially from the exclusion of many Hispanics, from, or their failure to qualify for, more skilled occupations. Thus, a large pool of able, but untrained Hispanics is available for manual employment. In short, because Hispanics do not have access to some jobs, they become preferred for others.

Occupation Status, Labor Force Participation and Unemployment.

Slowly, as Hispanics shift from a strong concentration in the lower paid manual jobs to craft and non-manual employment, their

occupational status relative to that of Anglos has improved.²⁶ Occupational parity, however, will require large increases in Hispanic employment in the manager and professional occupations, and a shift toward the better paid jobs within each--executives, physicians, and lawyers, for example.

The labor force participation of Hispanic males exceeds that of all males (and is well above that of Blacks). But this is a misleading result of an Hispanic age distribution which is concentrated at the younger ages, where participation rates tend to be high.²⁷ On an age specific basis, Hispanics have slightly lower participation rates than all men except at the very young ages.

The relatively low labor force participation of Hispanic females has long been interesting, first, because it has sometimes been explained as the result of Hispanic culture, and, second, because it has been so much lower than that of Black women. Analysis of 1970 census data provides considerable enlightenment on this subject, at least with respect to Mexican Americans. Their labor force participation increased greatly between 1960 and 1970, and while they still are less likely to be in the labor force than Anglo women, this is a result of their greater number of children and lower level of schooling.²⁸ Indeed, when controls are used for presence of preschool children, husband's income, and schooling, Mexican American wives are more likely than Anglos to be in the labor force, although not as likely as Black women. The author of this research suggests that familism, more specifically, attitudes toward employment by wives, has changed in Hispanic families. This is undoubtedly true for some families. However, if one manifestation of familism is the tendency to have large families, then this cultural orientation continues to be strong among Hispanics.

Hispanic female participation in the labor force has continued to increase in the 1970s to the point that Mexican Americans have an overall rate just below the forty-nine percent rate of all White females and Cuban participation is well above that of all White women.²⁹ Puerto Rican female participation has stayed low, however; less than a third of them are in the labor market.

The unique experience of Puerto Rican women, whose participation rates have been falling since before 1960, has been investigated and seems to be largely a New York City phenomenon. Two-thirds of all Puerto Rican women on the mainland live in the city, where their participation rates fell from thirty-eight percent in 1960 to twenty-eight percent in 1970.³⁰ This decline can be explained largely by demand shifts toward white collar employment, for which relatively few Puerto Rican women qualify because of schooling deficiencies, and away from nondurable manufacturing jobs, which have been an important source of employment for this group; and by increases in the number of families headed by Puerto Rican women, whose labor force activity,

presumably, is discouraged by a dependence on public welfare programs.³¹

Little analysis of Hispanic unemployment exists, in part because earnings and job status are seen to be more pressing problems for this group. In 1977, the Hispanic unemployment rate was 10.1 percent, midway between that of all White and Black workers. Unemployment was highest among Puerto Rican and lowest for Cubans and Central and South Americans. Unemployed Puerto Rican males, most of whom live in New York City, had an average duration of unemployment of sixteen weeks in 1977, compared to seven weeks for Mexican origin males.³²

IMMIGRATION

A good deal of research involving Hispanic immigration has been reported over the past decade. Much of this has been related to the illegal, undocumented, or unsanctioned phenomenon, but some good analysis of sanctioned immigration, for which more data exist, has also been done. I will summarize the results under four subheadings.

Causes

A general explanation for immigration of Hispanic populations to the United States is readily available: relatively greater economic opportunities here than in the nations of emigration. Greater detail than this is not as readily available. A regression analysis of Mexican immigration to the United States, 1962-74, published in a Mexican Journal, found that about three-quarters of the variation in annual gross migration (Gross data on sanctioned and unsanctioned immigration were used, the latter measured with U.S. figures on apprehensions.) was explained by the Mexican unemployment rate relative to that of the United States. Wage difference variables were not significant.³³ However, Mexican unemployment, by itself, explained the migration at least as well as relative unemployment. I interpret these results (to the extent that one can be confident of the data) to confirm what many observers have been saying right along: as population in Mexico and other countries increases in this century, unemployment and underemployment will also increase, and greater migration to the United States will follow. Of course, the demand for labor in the U.S. is fundamental to the initiation of that migration,³⁴ but the migration, itself, can bring about some increases in that demand.³⁵

Puerto Rican net migration to the United States, which is not immigration but is comparable in cause and effect, seems to be somewhat more responsive to relative wages in addition to relative unemployment, although data problems inhibit full confidence in that conclusion.³⁶ This matter, also, needs further study, particularly as it is connected to recent labor market and other phenomena in New York City.

The cause of Cuban migration was, of course, different from that of other Hispanics during the 1960s and 1970s and requires no great study.

Worker Characteristics

Sanctioned Hispanic immigrants to the United States come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds than do other immigrants.³⁷ This fact is dominant in the relatively low earnings and job status of the former. Cubans are somewhat of an exception to this generalization, as are immigrants from a few South American countries, notably Argentina.

There is now fairly good agreement on the characteristics of unsanctioned migrants.³⁸ Those from Mexico are poorly educated and unskilled in occupations which require specialized training. Most are supporting several family members, send money home, and are paid right at the minimum wage. Non-Mexican unsanctioned immigrants from the Western Hemisphere have slightly greater levels of schooling and tend to receive higher wages. Eastern Hemisphere illegals, largely from Asian nations, hold the best jobs and receive the highest wages.

Disagreement remains over one characteristics of unsanctioned migration--the extent to which the migration is temporary.³⁹ Everyone agrees that there is much seasonal migration from Mexico, for example, but whether the seasonal component is fifty percent or nearly one hundred percent of the total is not at all clear. The question is important for immigration policy, but it is not likely to be answered with much certainty.

Immigration Experience

Two major studies confirm the view that immigration, at least the sanctioned variety, is a selective phenomenon in the sense that those who immigrate are likely to be economically successful in the host country.⁴⁰ Success, however, is measured relative to second and third generation persons with the same national origins as the immigrants. This means that even though Mexican and other Spanish origin immigrants earn as much after ten to fifteen years in this country as native born Mexican and Spanish origin persons with the same productivity characteristics, they still earn much less than other immigrant groups. Second generation Hispanics, that is, those born in the United States who have one or more foreign born parents, share an experience in common with all other national origin groups--they have higher earnings than members of their ethnic group who are third generation U.S. residents.

Mexican immigrants have by far the least desirable occupational distribution of any immigrant group. In contrast, the occupations of Central and South Americans are quite similar to those of all foreign born workers. Much, but not all, of the Mexican experience can be

explained by low socioeconomic background. Similarly, much of the Cuban-Mexican differences in labor market experience is due to differences in personal characteristics, although Cubans are also able to get better returns on some of these characteristics.⁴¹ Whether public policies designed to assist Cubans have contributed to their greater success is not clear.

Featherman and Hauser conclude their analyses with a provocative question: Why haven't third generation Mexican Americans moved away from their national origin group toward the mean labor market and education experience of the total population? Mexican Americans would be an exception if they had done so because, as previously mentioned, within all national origin groups, third generation workers have less labor market success than those who belong to the second generation. Yet, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Hispanics will have to break out of this pattern if their experience is going to converge toward that of the general population in the face of continued Hispanic immigration.

Impacts

Sanctioned immigrants have quite mild impacts on job markets because their numbers are relatively small--about seven percent of annual additions to the labor force--and they are dispersed throughout the country. Unsanctioned immigration involves more people, with more geographically concentrated settlements. Still, whether they have substantial labor market impacts remains a subject of controversy.⁴² Nearly everyone would agree that unsanctioned immigrants must have some effect on the wages and employment of indigenous workers, but the effect can be slight or substantial, and in the absence of clear knowledge, either impact can be asserted.

Very little research has been done on the labor market impacts of unsanctioned immigrants. Two pieces of research, both framed against the view that the wage impacts should decrease with distance from the U.S.-Mexican border, suggest the existence of wage effects, but fall far short of definitively resolving the issues.⁴³

There are two ways to go about research on the labor market impacts of unsanctioned immigrants. One is the historical approach at a micro level, where the beginnings and growth of alien employment could be traced along with wage behavior and the reactions of domestic workers. If other influences could also be controlled, useful, micro-level knowledge could be enhanced. The other approach is to estimate econometrically wage and employment effects, but to do so information must be available, at least, on the number of alien workers and the wage elasticities of labor supply and demand for domestic workers. That information is not likely to exist. Because both approaches are so difficult, research based assessments of the labor market impacts of alien workers are not likely to be forthcoming.

Various studies indicate that the direct social service costs of unsanctioned immigrants are slight. That statement, however, does not speak to the indirect costs which are associated with displacement of domestic workers. Little knowledge has been developed in another impact area--that of effects on collective bargaining and other labor standards.

WORKER BEHAVIOR

Sources of job information and methods of actually obtaining jobs tend to be similar for all populations including Hispanics. The latter, however, rely more heavily on informal sources and methods--relatives and friends--than do Anglos. And they make less use of the more institutionalized sources, such as public and private employment services.⁴⁴ They also tend to use a smaller number of information sources than do other workers. These findings are thought to result from the "newness" of some Hispanics, from their consequent lack of information about labor market institutions, from language difficulties, and from low incomes which restrict the locations of residence and the resources available for transportation. Whether Hispanic culture also contributes to the extraordinary utilization of family and friends is not at all clear.

Informal information and job referral networks, which, incidentally, are particularly well developed among unsanctioned immigrants, are quite efficient in the sense of their rapid transmission of reliable job information. Their value is limited, however, by the range of job knowledge and experience of the network participants.⁴⁵ Thus, reliance by Hispanics on informal networks limits the range of their job search.

Several survey studies have now reported that English language facility has a positive association with Hispanic job success⁴⁶ (These are in addition to the econometric results cited earlier.), although this is not a uniform finding which holds for all areas and occupational labor markets. One study of a sizeable sample of Hispanics reported that the Mexican American respondents, themselves, consider language problems to be their greatest handicap for job search. This view was especially strong for foreign born respondents.⁴⁷

While a sizeable fraction--perhaps half or more--of Hispanic workers believe that Hispanics are the victims of employment discrimination, just a small fraction--ten to twenty percent--report that they have experienced job discrimination themselves.⁴⁸ One study of the subjective perceptions of Hispanic college graduates by Anglo business executives in the Midwest reported quite favorable perceptions, much more favorable than those of Black college graduates.⁴⁹ The latter were viewed rather negatively by the executive respondents, in part, due to a backlash from government affirmative action efforts for Blacks. These findings may not hold for all parts of the U.S.

The connection between values and attitudes of Hispanics and job success is an interesting question which has not been well researched. One careful study found that upward mobility among Mexican American college graduates is positively associated with possession of a work ethic, tolerance for ambiguity, feelings of psychological success, and motivation to manage.⁵⁰ Family and other value orientations did not distinguish between those who were mobile and those who were not. The sample size for this investigation was small, and the research needs replication in a variety of circumstances.

Another small study investigated the connection between occupation level and value orientation among Mexican Americans. Occupational level of the respondents was found to be positively associated with personal "activist" orientations and negatively related to familism.⁵¹ Unfortunately, the research did not disclose whether these associations are unique to Mexican Americans.

A study of Cuban women in the Miami area suggested that the economic need for employment and attitude assimilation into the U.S. society both increase their labor force participation. Employment of wives, however, did not bring about much change in husband's traditional attitude toward the role of wives or in the amount of housework performed by husbands.⁵²

Although many Hispanic workers would prefer to work with and for other Hispanics, it is not evident that they are any different from other ethnic groups in the U.S. in this respect, nor is it evident that this preference is strong enough to retard job advancement. Rankings of the importance of various job attributes appear to be similar for Hispanics and all other workers.⁵³ One interesting finding is that Hispanic workers see themselves as less successful, and have lower job satisfaction, than other workers, even when occupational level and earnings are controlled.⁵⁴ The nature and larger significance of that finding need amplification, at least for the Anglo academic and policy community.

FARM WORKERS

A current population survey of December 1973 found that just thirteen percent of all farm workers and twenty-nine percent of those in the Western region of the United States were of Spanish origin. These figures may err substantially on the low side because sampling methods do not adequately reach Hispanic households and living arrangements. Spanish origin workers were two-thirds of the 200,000 1973 migratory work force. Migratory workers comprised just twenty percent of all Hispanic farm workers, however. Even though Hispanic farm workers are more dependent than others on farm employment, it is, at best, a seasonal activity for most of them. Slightly less than half of Hispanic farm workers did 150 or more days of farm work in 1973. When not employed in farm work, most Hispanic farm workers withdraw from the labor force.⁵⁵

Research on migrants makes evident the chain process which is frequently involved in "settling out," where the migrant will work seasonably in agriculture in a northern state for several years before taking permanent nonfarm employment in the state. Much of the settling out process is facilitated by relatives and friends who preceded the migrant. Once migrants accept nonfarm jobs in the receiving area, nearly all consider themselves to be permanent rather than temporary residents.⁵⁶

A disturbing aspect of this research was the finding that many of the migrant workers were over age forty, and few had much facility with English. These characteristics inhibit mobility from migrant employment.

EMPLOYERS

It is well established as a general matter that Hispanics are underrepresented in government employment, both with respect to labor force size and the employment of other minorities. A study of local government employment in Texas, however, did find that Hispanics are more frequently employed as professionals than are Blacks. The major influence on Hispanic employment and utilization seemed to be the Hispanic proportion of the city-wide labor force and their schooling levels, rather than characteristics of the employing agencies.⁵⁷

Research on the attitudes of California and Texas managers found that they both expected and perceived less favorable work behavior from Mexican Americans than from other employees on the dimensions of dependency, initiative, and need for different supervisory techniques.⁵⁸ These findings raise more questions than they answer. How did actual behavior compare to that expected and perceived? How much of an influence on behavior is exerted by managerial expectations? What are the sources of manager expectations?

A major study of public and private employer processes, in the San Antonio area, as they affect Mexican Americans, is now nearly complete. Recruitment, selection, training, promotion, and affirmative action processes were examined in this research.⁵⁹

INTERMEDIARIES

Little is known about the working and effects of labor market intermediaries such as schools, the family, public and private employment services, CETA, and SER. It is evident that, in general, only a small fraction of Hispanic workers are aware of government employment and training services,⁶⁰ and those who are aware of them are probably not those most in need of help.⁶¹

Once Hispanics contact the government programs, they are likely to receive assistance with job placement, but the earnings impact of these programs remains unclear.⁶² Apparently, government services are

a last resort; those who can get jobs on their own are likely to get better jobs than the services can provide, with the exception of public service employment. The government programs are not necessarily at fault for this result. They have access only to the least desirable private sector job markets for the most part.

One survey of over 1,500 Mexican Americans workers reported that one quarter of them had participated in a public or private job oriented training program. Most of these programs had been for English language improvement. Less than two percent of all respondents had been in a government skill training program. Most participants in training programs found them to be helpful for obtaining employment or improving their language skills. Employer run programs received the best rating on this criterion, presumably because the employer training was conducted concurrently with employment.⁶³ A Florida study also reported general satisfaction by Hispanics with their CETA experience.⁶⁴

The impact of antidiscrimination statutes and programs on Hispanic employment has not yet been studied with any thoroughness. One investigation did report a negative association between the occupation level of Hispanics in 67 industries and the proportion of industry employment which was in firms with government contracts.⁶⁵ This result may reflect a firm size effect, however. Labor market processes tend to allocate Hispanics away from the big firms which have government contracts.⁶⁶

Daniel Moynihan has suggested that the mobilized political power of an ethnic group is an important source of upward job mobility for its members and that this kind of mobilization process is now developing for Hispanics in New York City.⁶⁷ However, the evidence for this thesis is not yet persuasive.

A major study of vocational education for Mexican Americans came up with the usual findings for vocational education generally. This kind of schooling still overemphasizes agriculture and home economics courses and provides insufficient offerings for the more rapidly growing clerical, technical, and health fields. Jobs obtained by vocational education graduates are frequently not related to their training. Employers often give preferences to other kinds of workers, those with experience or recent immigrants, for example.⁶⁸

SOME COMMENTS

It is evident from the preceding summaries that a great deal more research has been published about the labor market outcomes of Hispanics than about the institutional and personal processes and other influences which have produced the outcomes. We now have considerable information on the earnings, jobs, and labor force status of the Hispanic population as a whole and for several of its national origin components. We have some knowledge about the economic and societal

determinants of these outcomes, such as years of schooling. Least of all is known about the processes which go on in the labor market, carried out by institutions and workers, to affect the outcomes.

One clear research need is to refine and clarify the determinants of Hispanic earnings. While the returns to schooling are generally less for Hispanics than for Anglos, they appear to be possibly greater at certain educational levels and under certain circumstances. Clarification of the discrimination component of the Hispanic-Anglo earnings difference is also needed, at least to the point that we know whether the relative importance of discrimination to Hispanic earnings deficiencies is increasing or decreasing. More research is needed until consistency of results is reported.

It should also be said that the existing general inability of social scientists to explain earnings variation among American workers limits the extent to which we can ever understand Hispanic earnings and their differences from Anglos and other groups. The human capital model may be the best available for earnings regressions, but it is obvious from both the unexplained variance in individual earnings and a little thought that many earnings determinants are not captured by these models. Even the apparent explanation that is provided by human capital models is partially specious since, for example, schooling is sometimes the effect rather than the cause of earnings. All of these comments, of course, suggest that the unexplained residual earnings differences between Hispanics and Anglos will be considered as valid measures of discrimination only by the noncautious. It is strange that most of the noncautious on this point are academicians; few people outside of the academy take the residuals seriously as measures of discrimination.

Turning to labor market and related processes, it is evident that relatively little research is done in the area because facts are hard to come by. Government tends to collect data on outcomes rather than processes, and data are needed in this age of computer processing to ensure that a publishable article can be prepared or to increase the chances for government funded research. Furthermore, even when surveys do obtain primary data on processes it is not clear that we know enough about institutions and individual behavior to ask the right questions.

We need to know, for example, how additional schooling gets translated into additional earnings for Hispanics and other groups. What employers are contracted, which ones make job offers, for what jobs; what are the career mobility paths, values, and tenures of the different groups?

We do not know nearly enough about how various educational and school programs affect Hispanic job experience. Bilingual and ESL programs are the most prominent of these, but there may be less well

known experiments which are going on. Hispanic culture, as transmitted through the family, church, and language, continues to be discussed and occasionally investigated, but the implications, if any, for job success are not clear.

The processes by which government employment and training services do and do not achieve success need examination, along with research on the development of success measures themselves, since they are not always available or reliable for these programs. The selection, training, counseling, placement, and follow-up processes associated with SER, CETA, and other efforts are not easy to study, but doing so might result in important payoffs for these programs and their participants.

An Immigrant or Disadvantaged Group

Much of the research on Hispanic suggests to me that it is wrong to consider this population as simply a disadvantaged one, precisely analogous to Blacks and Native Americans. The reason for that judgment is that immigrants and their children are such a large part of the Hispanic population, and its aggregate experience is so much affected by that fact. Over 40 percent of the Spanish surname population of the United States was either foreign born or had at least one foreign born parent in 1970. That figure would have been significantly higher had more than a small fraction of unsanctioned immigrants been counted by the census. It is certainly higher today. A recent survey of Orange County, California, Mexican American workers reported that three quarters of the respondents were foreign born.⁶⁹ The other fact associated with my thesis is that the socioeconomic backgrounds and resultant labor market experience of Hispanic immigrants are well below those of other immigrants to the United States. The large number and below average job outcomes of Hispanic immigrants combine to dominate the statistical experience of the total Hispanic population.

It may be pointed out by way of suggesting that immigration is not the full story that third generation Hispanics are not any better off than those who have immigrant parents. I would suggest, however, that the third generation Hispanic experience is very strongly influenced by the socioeconomic backgrounds of their immigrant grandparents.

This is not to suggest that discrimination against Hispanics in the United States is unimportant, but rather that the dominant fact in the current labor market experience of Hispanics is immigration and not discrimination. The evidence, in fact, shows that the experience of nearly all third generation national origin groups in the United States is closely related to the socioeconomic characteristics of their immigrant grandparents. Despite their low starting levels, Hispanics have not been able to escape the power of this connection. Their failure to do so may have been partially a product of discrimination against them, but, then, that discrimination would appear

to have been at least as much against their economic class as against their ethnicity.

I contend, then, that for both policy and research purposes, Hispanics should be viewed not as purely a domestic disadvantaged group, or as purely an immigrant group, but as a disadvantaged group whose experience is very importantly influenced by immigration. This is not a matter of mere words. If Hispanics were viewed as I have suggested, both policy and research would consider the connection of immigration to their disadvantaged status and would also consider the matter of assistance to immigrant populations, Hispanics and others. It is my view that both better understanding of Hispanic experience in the United States and more responsive policy would follow.

Quality of Research

Several positive things can be said about recent Hispanic research. First, it has improved in both quantity and quality during the 1970s. Second, some of it, albeit a minor fraction, is of high quality. Third, there has been an improvement in the competence of the researchers who are entering the field. This applies to both experienced people and newly trained scholars.

Criticisms can also be easily made. There is still a good deal of casual, and, even sloppy research, both from a theoretical and empirical point of view. Sometimes this research is further marred by the obvious ideological or otherwise committed views of the researchers. I am not advocating that Hispanic researchers become non-ideological, but to have an impact on knowledge, the research itself must be conducted objectively and the editorializing confined to the larger meaning of the research results.

At the other end of the spectrum, some research which is carried out with sophisticated methods turns out to be sterile, most frequently because the inquiry was guided by an obsession with a particular methodology or by the availability of data, rather than by an initial interest in important questions. It is not rare to see researchers use more sophisticated methods than they know how to use wisely. Unfortunately, the world often gives value to multivariate quantitative analyses simply because few people have the technical knowledge to carry them out. The technical knowledge substitutes for our inability to recognize and reward wisdom.

The ideal kind of research, of course, combines intelligent thought about important relationships with rigorous and valid empirical examination of these relationships. Occasionally one sees this kind of study in the Hispanic field, but not often enough. Of course, this complaint applied generally in the social sciences as well.

Some of the research on Hispanics has been helpful for the formation of public and private policy. For example, we know that among

the other contributors to the low relative earnings of Hispanics are low levels of schooling, population concentrations in low wage areas, and discrimination. The dissemination of this information helps with public policy development and individual decision making. The help provided is limited, however, because we know so little about the processes which connect the key variables to earnings. It is not enough to know that in aggregate statistics high levels of schooling and high levels of earnings tend to go together, for Hispanics as well as others.

If policy is going to influence the pace at which Hispanics earnings move toward the mean, it must be informed, also, about the process and qualitative aspects by which schooling is translated into earnings. The importance of quality variations in schooling, occupational choice, career decisions, and the interaction of personal qualities with all of these, are some illustrations. Similarly, and even more importantly, this information is necessary for intelligent individual behavior. We sometimes forget that social phenomena are the product of interaction between individual choice and behavior and the environment (to use a broad gauged word). While it is true that individual decisions can be influenced by knowledge simply of the correlation between schooling and earnings, additional influence is exerted on individuals by their knowledge of the intervening variables which operate on this connection. Greater schooling will be more frequently chosen when that knowledge is present, and furthermore, the knowledge will bring about more effective exploitation of the schooling that is obtained.

Generally, research does not deal with the complicated processes I am talking about very well, and that is a major reason why most research has quite limited value for policy. Academic research, particularly tends to be rather passive in the sense that it is usually directed toward understanding phenomena which have already changed or are in the process of changing. That is, it tends to focus on the past. This kind of activity can be quite useful and, perhaps, it is the appropriate role of the academic, but it does not meet policy needs very well because policy must be directed at the present and future, and study of the past is often not adequate for that function. Then, more process research, directed to current behavior, is needed to help policy makers. But, as we know, this kind of research is difficult, costly, and frequently unsuccessful. Consequently, most good policy will continue to result from intelligent perception which is not research based. It is, nevertheless, my hope that researchers will help by conducting more of the kind of process research that I have discussed here.

REFERENCES

1. An example of this kind of research in its best form is Morris J. Newman, "A Profile of Hispanics in the U.S. Work Force," Monthly Labor Review, December 1978, pp. 3-14.
2. See Geoffrey Carliner, Journal of Human Resources, Vol. II, No. 2, Spring 1976, pp. 172-184; Barry R. Chiswick, "Immigrants and Immigration Policy," in William Fellner, ed., Contemporary Economic Problems, Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1978, pp. 285-325; David L. Featherman and Robert M. Hauser, Opportunity and Change, New York: Academic Press, 1978, Ch. 8; James D. Gwartney and James E. Long, "The Relative Earnings of Blacks and Other Minorities," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 31, No. 3, April 1978, pp. 336-346; James E. Long, "Productivity, Employment Discrimination, and the Relative Economic Status of Spanish Origin Males," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 3, December 1977, pp. 357-373; Richard Santos, "Earnings of Spanish Origin Persons in the Midwest," mimeo, 1978.
3. Carliner, op. cit.
4. Albert W. Niemi, Jr., "Racial and Ethnic Differences in Returns on Educational Investment in California and Texas," Economic Inquiry Vol. 12, No. 3, September 1974, pp. 398-402.
5. Gwartney and Long, op. cit.
6. Carliner, op. cit.
7. Chiswick, op. cit.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid. Gwartney and Long, op. cit., report negative effects of foreign birth, possibly due to incomplete control of other earnings influences.
10. Chiswick, op. cit.; Featherman and Hauser, op. cit.
11. Featherman and Hauser, op. cit.
12. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., Walter Fogel, and Fred Schmidt, The Chicano Worker, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977, pp. 46-48.
13. Long, op. cit.; Gwartney and Long, op. cit.
14. Briggs, Fogel, and Schmidt, op. cit.
15. Long, op. cit.

16. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, "Persons of Spanish Origin in the U.S.," Series P-20, Washington, U.S.G.P.D., annual numbers from the March survey of each year.
17. See Lester Thurow, Civil Rights Digest, Winter-Spring 1976.
18. The ten percent figure is from J.A. Williams, Jr., P.G. Beeson, and D.R. Johnson, "Some Factors Associated with Income Among Mexican Americans," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 53, No. 4, March 1973, pp. 710-715. The seventy-five percent figure is from Long, op. cit.
19. Gwartney and Long, op. cit.
20. Long, op. cit.
21. Albert W. Niemi, Jr., "Wage Discrimination Against Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the New York SMSA: An Assessment of Educational and Occupational Differences," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 55, No. 1, June 1974, pp. 112-120.
22. Gwartney and Long, op. cit.
23. Long, op. cit.; Dudley L. Poston, Jr., David Alvarez, and Marta Tienda, "Earnings Differences Between Anglo and Mexican American Male Workers in 1960 and 1970: Changes in the 'Cost' of Being Mexican American," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 57, No. 3, December 1976, pp. 618-631. I am skeptical of some of the results reported in the latter article. For example, the study reports that in 1960, Mexican American males age 40-49 had median earnings which were 35 percent below those of their Anglo counterparts and schooling differences explained two-thirds of this difference. In 1970, this cohort, now aged 50-59 had earnings which were 31 percent less than those of their Anglo counterparts and schooling explained less than half of this difference. These results don't make sense. Schooling changes vary little after age 40 and, with the Mexican American-Anglo earnings difference falling, schooling differences should explain more of it in 1970 than in 1960. The Mexican American samples used by the authors were larger in 1970 than in 1960 and associated changes in sample characteristics may account for this anomaly.
24. Briggs, Fogel and Schmidt, op. cit., p. 56
25. Ibid., Ch. 4; Niemi, "Wage Discrimination....," op. cit.
26. Walter Fogel, "Job Gains of Mexican American Men," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 91, No. 10, October 1968, pp. 22-27.
27. See Newman, op. cit.

28. Rosemary Santana Cooney, "Changing Labor Force Participation of Mexican American Wives: A Comparison with Anglos and Blacks," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 56, No. 2, September 1975, pp. 253-261.
29. U.S. Bureau of the Census, op. cit.
30. Rosemary Santana Cooney, "Intercity Variations in Puerto Rican Female Participation," Journal of Human Resources, XIV, 2, pp. 222-235.
31. Ibid.
32. Newman, op. cit.
33. M.I. Blejer, H.G. Johnson, and A.C. Corzecanski, "Un Analisis de los Determinantes Economicos de la Migracion Mexicana Legal e Illegal Hacia los Estado Unidos," Demographia y Economia, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 326-340.
34. See Michael J. Piore, Birds of Passage, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
35. Walter Fogel, "U.S. Immigration Policy in an Era of Unsanctioned Migration," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 32, No. 3, April, 1980.
36. Rita M. Maldonado, "Why Puerto Ricans Migrated to the U.S. in 1947-73," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 99, No. 9, Sept. 1976, pp. 7-18. See, also, the comment on this article by Steven P. Zell, Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 100, No. 8, August 1977, pp. 29-34.
37. Featherman and Hauser, op. cit.
38. The best source of information in David S. North and Marion F. Houston, Illegal Aliens: Their Characteristics and Role in the U.S. Labor Market, Washington, D.C: U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1975.
39. See Fogel, "U.S. Immigration Policy...", op. cit.; and Wayne A. Cornelius, Mexican Migration to the U.S.: The View From Rural Sending Communities, Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Studies, M.I.T., 1976 (mimeo).
40. Featherman and Hauser, op. cit.; Chiswick, op. cit.
41. Tereas A. Sullivan and Silvia Pedraza-Bailey, "Differential Success among Cuban-American and Mexican-American Immigrants," Washington Research and Development Grant No. 21-17-78-03, U.S. Employment and Training Administration, 1979.

42. See Walter Fogel, Mexican Illegal Alien Workers in the U.S., Los Angeles: Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, 1978.
43. Ibid, Ch. VII; Barton Smith and Robert Newman, "Depressed Wages along the U.S.-Mexico Border: An Empirical Analysis," Economic Inquiry, XV, January, 1977, pp. 51-66.
44. Juarez and Associates, A Survey of Mexican American Workers in Two Selected Urban Areas, preliminary report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
45. Robert Mier, Industrial Employment Opportunities and the Hispanic Community: The Case of Pilsen, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
46. For example, Jaurez and Associates, op. cit.; Mier, op. cit. and Marge Lauritsen, A Development Conceptual Research Project on Labor Market Participation of Hispanic Women, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
47. Jaurez and Associates, op. cit.
48. Ibid.
49. R.V. Elicano, Application of the Delphi Technique to the Analysis of Hispanic American Employment Problems, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
50. Sam Gould, An Analysis of Career Patterns and Problems among Mexican American College Graduates, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
51. Charles L. Chandler, "Value Orientations among Mexican Americans in a Southwestern City," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 58, No. 3, April 1974, pp. 262-271.
52. Myrra Marx Forree, "Employment Without Liberation: Cuban Women in the U.S.," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 1, June 1979 pp. 35-50.
53. Juarez and Associates, op. cit.
54. Sullivan and Pedroza-Bailey, op. cit.
55. L.W. Smith, Social and Economic Characteristics of Spanish Origin Hired Farmworkers in 1973, Economic Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1976.
56. H.M. Choldin and G.D. Trout, Mexican Americans in Transition: Migration and Employment in Michigan Cities, report to the

U.S. Department of Labor (Manpower Administration), undated (circa 1970).

57. Grace Hall and Alan Saltzstein, "Equal Employment Opportunity for Minorities in Municipal Government," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 57, No. 4, March 1977, pp. 864-872.
58. C.J. Whitehead and A.S. King, "Differences in Manager's Attitudes Toward Mexican and Non-Mexican Americans in Organizational Authority Relations," Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 53, No. 4, March 1973, pp. 760-771.
59. The study is being carried out by Louis B. Wolitz, University of Texas, San Antonio, and should be completed in early 1980.
60. Juarez and Associates, op. cit.; Alfredo Mirande, Factors Influencing the Participation of Elderly Spanish Surnamed Americans in CETA and Title IX of the Older American Acts, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
61. Lauritzen, op. cit.
62. For one study of this question, see David E. Schulenburger and Charles E. Krider, Measuring the Earnings Impact of Labor Market Programs on Hispanic Americans, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
63. Jaurez and Associates, op. cit.
64. Jose L. Sclernou, Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of the Unmet Needs of Spanish Americans in Broward County, Florida, report to the U.S. Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1979.
65. Jerolyn R. Lyle, "Factors Affecting the Job Status of Workers with Spanish Surnames," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 96, No. 4, April 1973, pp. 10-16.
66. Briggs, Fogel, and Schmidt, op. cit. Ch. 4.
67. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "Patterns of Ethnic Succession: Blacks and Hispanics in New York City," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 99, No. 1, Spring 1979, pp. 1-14.
68. Sam Schulman, J. Earl Williams, and Robert Guerra, Mexican American Youth and Vocational Education in Texas, Houston: Center for Human Resources, University of Houston, 1973.
69. Juarez and Associates, op. cit.

PROGRAMS, POLICY AND RESEARCH ON
HISPANIC AMERICANS (SMALL GROUP SESSION)

Fred Romero (Moderator)*

We are coming to the point in this symposium that is really the meat of it all. We have four small groups; the topics are given to you in your booklet. I would like to work it this way. We have got some resource people assigned to those groups, but I am going to go beyond designating them to be resource people. Instead, I am going to designate one in each group to lead that group along so that we can make the maximum use of the time available. For example, in Session I--Workers and their Characteristics, the session dealing with special groups, I would like to have Dr. Tienda lead that group and move it along. Session II on Employers and the Job Environment, Dr. Tirado, will you handle that for us? Session III on Labor Markets, if we can have Dr. Oaxaca? On Institutions and Interventions I would like to have Dr. Barnow lead that group; will you handle this for us, please?

Essentially, there are two things that should come out of these sessions. One of the goals of this symposium is to solicit advice and counsel from you regarding a research agenda for the 80s and beyond. You heard panelists yesterday outline operational issues, problems that program operators are experiencing, and recommend research activities to help move those programs along.

Also, Dr. Rosen, in reading Dr. Ginzberg's paper, outlined broad areas of basic research. He laid out a beginning, areas for probable research. You can go beyond what Dr. Ginzberg suggested, obviously, but you know that as the Chairman of the National Commission of Employment Policy, he is going to be directing that Commission to lend some attention next year to the areas he outlined for us. So, your deliberations in these small group discussions on the topics you have been assigned should culminate in a series of suggestions concerning research for this fiscal year and beyond. You should arrange that list in priority form. You heard Dr. Rosen indicate that the resources are limited, and we want to make the best use of the resources available for research.

A second major area that I think you should give some attention to is how can we glue together participants in this symposium (and

*Dr. Fred Romero is Deputy Administrator of Policy, Evaluation and Research, Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor.

others that could not show up for various reasons) so that we can tap this valuable resource for our purposes in the Department of Labor. I know that individually, and perhaps two or three of you at a time, will be coming to us with proposals. That is one way you're going to become involved. But, it appears to me that we need your advice and counsel on broad questions of policy, a contribution based on your research and experiences.

I am really suggesting a way, a mechanism, for seeking and obtaining your contributions beyond those you make from research. We want you to assist us also by providing your advice and counsel on important questions; questions which come to us from time to time and which require a quick turn around time.

So, in summary then, we need to get back in there, start these discussions, move them along quickly, and put your ideas down on what you think are the important problems that we should be looking at. You heard the various panelists, the various papers that were presented, and they should suggest something to you. Plus, you have your own ideas about things. Let us all culminate our discussion in recommendations for researchable areas. You outline them for us on a priority basis.

The second task is to give some attention to a mechanism that we can establish, that we could then use, to bring the Department together with the academic community for research and policy purposes as far as Hispanics are concerned. I am going to be asking that the people that I designated to guide these discussions, to report back to us during lunch. That is the only time we will have available.

WORKERS AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

Summary Report

Marta Tienda (Group Leader)*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this session was to identify research and program/policy issues concerning how the characteristics of Hispanic workers affect their employment experience. Women, youth, immigrants, and rural workers are groups deserving special attention. This topic, while certainly outside the scope of our assignment, resulted in a fruitful discussion about the involvement of researchers and practitioners in CETA programs and policy activities for Hispanic workers. These are reflected in the recommendations. In order to summarize properly the substance of the dialogue and to distinguish issues about Hispanic workers from those about Hispanics as researchers, this report is organized into three parts. The first concerns the dialogue about the role and function of Hispanic researchers within the Department of Labor activities. Second, a summary of key issues and research questions about Spanish origin workers and their characteristics is reported. Several recommendations from the dialogue of the entire session are reported in the final section.

Hispanic Researchers and their Role and Function

About half of the session was devoted to a discussion of the role and function of Hispanic scholars in DOL employment and training activities. The group recognized that the link between basic research and employment policy is mediated by a political process, which transcends specific projects and individuals. And the implications of this circumstance were elaborated. One clear implication is the need for long term and regular dialogue among practitioners, researchers, and policy analysts working on issues and problems confronting Spanish origin workers. Also, it is important for both practitioners and basic researchers to become intimately familiar with the complex processes that translate specific programs and studies to employment policies. An important component of this process is the selection and funding of CETA projects and research projects.

*Dr. Marta Tienda is Assistant Professor in the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Generally speaking, the ability to conduct sound policy analyses or even to translate basic research into policy-relevant findings is not one which academicians or program directors usually acquire through standard training. Rather, this important skill must be cultivated purposefully and carefully. It would appear that the Department of Labor could play a crucial role in fostering a badly needed link between research and employment policies by bringing together individuals concerned with similar problems facing Hispanic origin workers. This might be accomplished through specific workshops and/or networks geared to maintain regular communication among practitioners, researchers, and policy analysts who share similar substantive interests. A regularized and timely flow of information, including the dissemination of pertinent research findings, would facilitate the triangulation among researchers, practitioners, and policy analysts.

Workers and their Characteristics

Several issues and research topics were identified in the general discussion about worker's characteristics. These are listed in the order in which they emerged, and not in order of priority. Given the diversity of the group in terms of work affiliation and geographic residence, it would have been difficult to order these concerns in terms of relative importance. Obviously, all participants emphasized issues which most directly affected them in their professional activities. The diversity of individual backgrounds is reflected in a rich set of issues which provide a preliminary skeleton for devising a long-term research agenda.

1. Special Problems of Rural Workers

What are the current conditions (wages, housing, services) of migrant farm workers? What special unmet needs exist and how might these be addressed? At present, there is far more data about the characteristics of urban workers than rural workers. This problem is as true of published statistics as of intercensal surveys. Although Hispanic origin workers are largely concentrated in urban labor markets, there are substantial numbers residing and/or working in rural or nonmetropolitan areas. Because of the generally more limited income and employment opportunities in rural areas, the need for information about the circumstances of rural workers is even more critical. Until key problems are adequately identified, no policy is likely to be formulated to address these. Special surveys of migrant farm laborers are also needed to detect changes in their composition, migration patterns both in terms of necessity to ascertain whether and to what extent rural workers may be more vulnerable to economic downswings by monitoring their unemployment experiences.

2. Women

Is it appropriate to design and develop programs to increase the labor force participation of Hispanic women, or are social norms and traditions against female employment so strong that low rates of labor

force participation (vis-à-vis Anglo and Black women) will persist? Do mothers with school-aged children have any special needs for training and/or day care? To what extent can Hispanic women become more adequately represented in non-traditional jobs through specialized training programs? What are the circumstances that explain why female-headed households have such high poverty rates (especially Puerto Rican female-headed households)? Are special programs required to enhance the employability of female-headed households?

3. *Immigrants*

What are the most important problems faced by immigrant workers as they attempt to incorporate themselves to the U.S. labor market? How might these "adjustment" problems be attenuated through employment and training programs? What are the most important priority groups or target areas for developing demonstration projects? Is it the case that immigrant Hispanic workers compete with native born workers for jobs by undercutting wages? To date, this argument has been advanced by a number of scholars, but no systematic empirical investigation of this premise has been advanced. It remains, therefore, an untested assertion. The question about the labor market impact of Hispanic origin workers is wide open. However, as the numbers of Spanish-speaking immigrant workers increase, the need to pay attention to the labor market impacts will become even more critical.

4. *Youth*

How do the eligibility criteria for employment and training programs effectively exclude potential workers from participation in programs which might enhance their employability? For example, are there individuals "in-between" programs, such as high school drop-outs, who do not qualify for current CETA programs because of age or other eligibility criteria? What mechanisms currently exist to reach youths who are eligible for CETA programs? How might this information be made available to researchers and practitioners, but especially to policy analysts for expansion or modification of current operating guidelines? How do the special needs of youth differ from those of adult workers? What school curricula result in the best long term employment experiences for Hispanic origin youth? Does this vary by geographic residence and by national origin?

5. *General Issues*

(a) The familial context of labor force participation.

How might our understanding of the employment experience of Hispanic workers be broadened by examining labor force behavior in a familial context? Glenn Cain's work on the National Unemployment Commission is instructive in this regard. To what extent is the measured labor market hardship of individuals attenuated by increasing total work effort of other family members? Do patterns of labor supply vary significantly among national origin groups, nativity groups, age groups, residence groups, or between the sexes? More generally, what kinds of workers are most likely to live in multiple

earner families? Does kinship play a special role in recruitment of other workers or in shaping the labor market patterns of Hispanic origin workers? Does this influence retention and turn-over?

(b) Worker's characteristics versus market characteristics.

What is the relative importance of worker's characteristics versus market characteristics in determining the employment experiences of Hispanics? This concern is paramount for policy because the nature of policies needed to change workers' characteristics (generally employment and training programs) would differ considerably in nature and scope from those which would be needed to alter regional wage inequities, internal labor markets, discriminatory hiring practices, and other less covert forms of institutionalized discrimination. Accordingly, what are the key barriers to the employment of Hispanic origin workers in high status, high pay jobs? Which of these barriers are amenable to policy intervention? What categories of workers are most likely to confront specific barriers to employment and how do these vary across market settings?

(c) Socio-cultural characteristics.

How important is ethnicity (national origin) for shaping the labor market experiences of Spanish origin workers and to what extent does ethnicity interact or correspond to social class differences among Hispanics?

How important are language usage and other cultural traits for determining the employability of Spanish origin workers? Are language programs a necessary part of employment and training programs or is the net impact of language acquisition on employment negligible?

What other socio-cultural characteristics influence the way in which Hispanic workers are allocated to jobs? What are the key dimensions of variation in socio-cultural characteristics among Hispanic origin workers and how do these differentially impact employment experiences of selected subgroups?

C. Recommendations

(1) Establish a Hispanic scholarship (fellowship) program for young scholars to increase the number of Hispanics trained in employment and training areas of manpower. This could take the form of the Brookings fellowship program.

(2) Establish a council of Hispanic scholars interested in the field of employment and training of Hispanic workers. The council's main charge will be: a) setting a research agenda for the study of Hispanic employment and training needs; b) communicating with professionals involved in the organization and implementation of manpower and training program; c) involving both practitioners and experts concerned with Hispanic employment issues in the policy process.

(3) Endorse the recommendation of the Levitan report concerning expanding the sample size of the Current Population Survey so that a sufficiently large sample of Spanish origin workers to permit more disaggregated analyses can be obtained.

(4) Earmark funds on an annual basis for special surveys and studies which will be geared to addressing key gaps and emerging issues about the labor market experiences of Hispanic workers in a regular and timely fashion.

(5) Encourage a broader and more systematic dissemination of knowledge generated by practitioners and researchers by organizing and sponsoring "research utilization projects" to promote knowledge transfers through demonstration projects and special workshops organized along substantive lines.

(6) Compile a roster of individuals currently working on various problems facing Spanish origin workers either through basic research, CETA programs or policy analysis. These should be organized along key substantive areas identified in section B.

EMPLOYERS AND THE JOB ENVIRONMENT

Summary Report

Miguel Tirado (Group Leader)*

Our section sought to focus on the plight of those Hispanics who are employed. We felt that there was a need to put some emphasis on that, and fortunately we had some resources in our group which enabled us to come up with some rather specific recommendations. We discussed some of the problems that working Hispanic men and women have to contend with in terms of violation with work standards, occupational safety, and health problems. The issue of the impact of recession in terms of layoffs of those segments of the Hispanic workforce which have been able, over the past few years, to move into skilled trades and as a consequence, to face the threat of loss of the gains they have achieved. We took issue with some of the funding orientations with regards to CETA in terms of skill up-grading. And we thought that there was some need for research into how CETA may be able to address this need. That is, the gains already made in terms of Hispanic employment should be shown.

We also discussed in our group some of the specific research priorities that we felt should be presented to you for DOL funding and how resources of our own research group could be effectively utilized. Some of those priorities address this whole question of obstacles to the achievement of skilled jobs and mid-level positions in business. There was concern among our group that there was all too little research, not only on workers' profiles, but also organizational profiles in terms of organizational behavior of businesses and other entities to hire Hispanics. We know so little about this subject. We recommend a look into those successful efforts in private enterprise where businesses have achieved more hiring and retention of Hispanics to see the ingredients of success. Also, more research is needed on the interaction between certain profiles of the workers and the organizational profiles.

A concern was expressed about the nature of coordination of governmental agencies dealing with skill up-grading. Specifically, the concern was a need for closer interaction, closer coordination between the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce.

*Dr. Miguel Tirado is Professor of Industrial Relations and Public Administration, California State University, Sonoma.

There was a specific mention of the need for developing entrepreneurial skills, management skills. All too often, CETA programs stop before developing these skills. As a consequence, the ability of Hispanics to rise beyond that secondary labor market is inhibited.

In terms of network, we came up with some specific recommendations I thought should be presented here. One relates to the need to do research on individual sub groups in the Hispanic labor force. We felt it was important not to over emphasize that and to recognize that there are benefits from those characteristics shared by the Hispanics in the work force. So there is a need to recognize both the factors that differentiate and the factors that unify us.

With regard to Doctoral Fellowships and Post Doctoral Fellowships--a point that Marta brought up in her group about the need to relate academicians to practitioners--we felt that there is a need to start orienting some of these post-doctoral fellowships and doctoral fellowship toward community based organizations which are actively seeking to provide jobs for Hispanic workers. In so doing, the fellows would not only benefit in terms of their own expertise but also would make a significant contribution to these front line groups.

Also, we were interested in seeking the establishment of an internal labor market advisory group to coordinate those of us who are interested in the areas of employment and promotion and possibly tie us to the efforts of those academicians involved with the national symposium on Hispanic business and economy.

LABOR MARKETS

Summary Report

Ronald Oaxaca (Group Leader)*

The small group session on labor markets was organized around the following topic areas: job search, labor market information, human capital investment, regional economic development, and mobility. A stimulating interchange of ideas took place which identified future research needs pertaining to the labor market experiences of Hispanics in the U.S. While time did not permit a formal priority ranking of the research suggestions brought out in the discussions, certain themes which seem to command general interest emerged.

A potentially fruitful line of inquiry is to conduct comparative studies of the labor market experiences of different Hispanic groups. It was recognized that Hispanic Americans are a diverse group with a common language. It may be as instructive or even more instructive to compare Hispanic groups with each other rather than taken as a whole and compared with the non-Hispanic population. The comparison would include educational attainment, other human capital formation, and processes of socialization.

There were a number of suggestions for research which revolved around the effects of industrial and regional development on Hispanic workers. Specifically, there is the need for more studies of the differential impact of external economic condition on Hispanics. There might include the aftermath of declining industries which traditionally employ many Hispanics, changing regional economic conditions, and the impact of anti-growth and development policies. It was recognized that case history type studies of particular industries known to employ many Hispanics may be useful, e.g. a study of the restaurant industry in New York City.

With the dramatic changes in social and economic roles in women, it was evident that more research is needed which focuses on Hispanic women. The more that is know about the labor market experiences of Hispanic women, the more we will learn about related issues such as income distribution among Hispanic households. A related suggestion pertains to studying the allocation of time within the household and its relationship to Hispanic female labor force participation.

*Dr. Ronald Oaxaca is Associate Professor in the Department of Economics, University of Arizona.

There was considerable discussion devoted to job search and labor mobility among Hispanics. It was recommended that more attention be given to research on the actual process of job search among Hispanic workers. This pertains to the means used and the effects of the individual's family setting and community links. More should be known about the role of labor market intermediaries both private and public, and formal and informal.

There was some discussion devoted to the need for more research of rural labor market dynamics. It is expected that the disproportionate presence of low income Hispanics in these labor markets makes such research especially important to discovering ways to break the poverty cycle among significant numbers of Hispanic families.

The remaining suggestions for additional research can be easily summarized. It was proposed that it might be interesting to investigate the labor market impact of the option of Puerto Ricans to move back and forth from the mainland to Puerto Rico. Another suggestion called for a thorough study of the impact of public service employment policies on Hispanics. A recommendation was made that dual labor market and market segmentation concept be given more attention in discerning what they can contribute to understanding the labor market processes as they affect Hispanic workers. Finally, it was pointed out that income is not a perfect measure of well being and that additional measures of welfare should be considered.

INSTITUTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS

Summary Report

Louise Wolitz (Group Leader)*

We had a very wide range discussion, and I will try to summarize it. The first main point was that we would like to see research on better coordination of programs at all levels of operation. The linkages between programs mentioned ranged throughout the whole two hours, but let me try to point out some of them.

How the CETA program links with the WIN program, with the educational system, especially in the area of youth, with job creation, and with economic development agencies was discussed. Also, mentioned were the relationship, within CETA, between the prime sponsors and the CBOs or community based organizations, relationship between CETA and small employers (It was pointed that large employers very often sit on PIC councils and on other policy making bodies, but it is the small employer that tends to provide many jobs for CETA trainees.), the linkage between CETA and the agricultural workers, and the linkage between CETA and the arts.

Other points discussed were the problems in serving Hispanics in areas where they are a small minority rather than a large group; access by community organizations to the information and data that they need, particularly data other than federal data such as those provided by state education agencies or health agencies; the problem of the participation of undocumented workers to a whole range of CETA services (and what may be the legal and other issues surrounding that because such an agency may or may not restrict its services to the undocumented workers and what effect residency in the state should have on CETA services).

Somebody suggested studying how the community based organizations actually view the prime sponsor, and what changes they would like to see in prime sponsor activities. There was a suggestion that we need more research explicitly focused on Puerto Ricans and the island of Puerto Rico.

The final suggestion was to survey existing advocacy groups (CBOs) and find out in some systematic way what they are doing, what

*Dr. Louise Wolitz is Assistant Professor in the Division of Environmental Studies, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

kind of groups and programs have been successful and how successful programs and strategies may be repeated throughout the country. Those are basically the points that were touched.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Fred E. Romero*

Let me share with you the three general conclusions I reached regarding this symposium, especially with regard to what I overheard in the work sessions. The first conclusion, the obvious one, is that we do have an outstanding group of Hispanic academics who are not only willing and interested, but are also capable of doing the research work that we have to get done to improve the prospects of Hispanics in the labor market. This is not to foreclose the efforts of non-Hispanics who have been making contributions to our welfare for a long, long time. I refer specifically to such gentlemen as Dr. Fogel whose work I enjoyed reading and used in doing some descriptive work while at Princeton. People like that.

The second major conclusion is the recognition among academics that there be a strong linkage between their work and the operational problems at the local level. They are seeking ways to effecting these linkages by asking that the relevant literature be disseminated and research seminars be conducted which bring practitioners and researchers together. Both are important--both are essential.

The third conclusion, equally critical, is the need to create a linkage between the research product and the policy formulation process. The Department needs assistance in this area.

All three conclusions seem important. It is up to us here to ensure that you are involved in the conduct of research. Dr. Rosen explained a process for more effectively carrying out research. His is only one approach. But completing a study funded by DOL is not the end of it. We need your help in making the connection between the findings in your studies and the formulation of forward-looking policy. This connection is non-existent today and it would be very useful to us to have your contribution in this area. Finally, it is important that we share our knowledge of what is going on in R&D.

This symposium has been very helpful to me personally as I am sure it's been to all of you. We will follow it up with one more next year.

*Dr. Fred Romero is Deputy Administrator of Policy, Evaluation and Research, Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor.

CONCLUDING THE SYMPOSIUM

275

*The previous numbered page in
the original document was blank*

CLOSING ADDRESS

David Alvarez*

Obviously, giving more attention to Hispanics in a symposium like this is a step in the right direction. It is an attempt to combine those who direct programs that try to affect Hispanics, those in academia who often do research which may impact on those programs, and those who are doing the programs. Often the academicians know what is going on in the programs; so they could take their research findings and offer to help in a variety of ways. This is a step in the right direction.

Hispanics were not only invited but were also involved in the planning and preparation for this symposium. Hispanics too often have been ignored and continue to be ignored today by the dominant society. Yet meetings like this at least offer some hope.

I will not try to summarize this conference. I will concentrate on trying to point out some of the things I consider important, and then note some of the challenges I see presented by this conference, including some of the things that were not thoroughly discussed.

The things I am going to say first are not necessarily new, but we need to synthesize them. Tomás Rivera started us on the right note with something which should not get lost, both for academicians and for those who direct programs. Rivera stressed that we are dealing with human beings. One woman raised a question early in one of the sessions about the human orientation of her program. Her concern was that CETA itself might lack some human or person-oriented focus. I think those of us in academia, as much as those who direct programs (after we have been there a long time, if we are not careful) forget that we are dealing with human beings. Human beings become objects, and we must all be careful about that. Academicians and program people can help remind each other.

I loved Tomás Rivera's concept of the "abrazo" because some things are said in Spanish that can never be said in English in the same way. People need abrazos; CETA personnel and academicians, also.

Ernest Green and others reminded us (but Ernest Green was one of the first speakers to mention it) that government, whatever the government is, cannot do it alone.

*Dr. David Alvarez is Dean of the School of Behavioral Sciences, Pan American University.

CETA needs the help of academicians, and I think in this conference one of the most positive things is that recognition, increased recognition of DOL, of the need to try to coordinate better what academicians and CETA people are doing. So often we are each going in our own direction, and nobody knows what the other one is doing. Hopefully, this is a step in the direction to correct that. Social scientists so often do their own research and never think about what they are going to be doing with it or whether somebody else can do something with it.

There was a great emphasis, one which I appreciated, on the need for accurate data. In the session yesterday, Lynda de la Vina, said that accurate data are the fundamental basis for academic research. I would add, too, that accurate data are also the basis for good CETA programs because if you do not have the data, you do not know whom you are serving or what you are serving or what you are trying to do.

Many of the speakers--Sar Levitan, Marta Tienda, Rosemary Santana Cooney, Gilbert Cardenas, Richard Santos, Walter Fogel--dealt with problems related to the data, the data sources.

Equally as important as having that data is knowing where it is and how to make it available to us. That is one area where I think a gap exists, and one of these speakers a few minutes ago mentioned having a network. I think for Chicanos at least, and I think some of the academicians here will agree with me, that what Carlos Arce has done with the network is one of the most promising things for Chicanos, so that Chicanos know what Chicanos are doing throughout the country.

I would argue that we need something like that in CETA which would reach not only CETA program directors but would also reach academicians so that we could know what others are doing, where the resources are, and what we can look at. Then, not everybody will start out trying to invent the wheel. I think we waste a lot of time. And I would bet you the CETA program directors waste a lot of time in different areas throughout the country because each one is starting to invent the wheel when someone has already started the process elsewhere. So we need to work on building a network.

Parenthetically, I am a demographer, or used to be a demographer; so let me put in a plug for the 1980 census. Many people mentioned the census. The last person was Dr. Leo Estrada, who came in late, because he is too busy trying to solve the problems of the census as far as it relates to Hispanics, but we need to improve the Hispanos data. I know that all of us are looking forward with anticipation to it. There are problems in it. It is not a perfect solution, but at least we will begin to have data not only for the Hispanos as a whole, but also for sub groups. Some of us are very excited about that. I do not know if you know that the 1980 census will include data provided for not only the Hispanic total but also for certain areas

for sub groups, the Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or whatever the large groups is in that particular region. So that will be very exciting.

It was clear throughout the conference that we academicians need to be concerned more with the usefulness of our research. It is important not only to do research but also that in research we should be aware of the implications and the uses or applications.

I have always considered the type of research I have done. I have been more concerned with applied sociology than theoretical sociology. I feel that if the social sciences have anything to do, they have to get down and see what they are studying, what they are doing, what are the implications of the research in the real world.

Too often we academicians do our research, write our papers, publish them in journals that nobody reads except other academicians and other social scientists who share their findings with other academicians and other social scientists. We need to be very careful about that.

Howard Rosen made a number of good suggestions related to the whole matter of what we are doing as academicians in terms of dealing with the real world in his suggestions to the young scholars. I want to compliment whoever helped in all this preparation and whoever came up with the idea of young scholars because I think one of the things that is needed is to permit persons who have not had much input into things and were not ready yet to give major papers to have some exposure to this information and to make personal contacts.

Many challenges face us. Very quickly I will mention some of the things I would raise for your consideration without trying to provide answers. I like to think I am a humanist. I may or may not be right about that, but I think I am. Let me start then by raising an issue. Bill Kuvlesky asked at one time what is the primary purpose? Is it to attack unemployment or to improve the quality of life? Many speakers directly or indirectly touched on this. The session on the socioeconomic profile of the Hispanic American worker raised this issue as did Sar Levitan when he reminded us that the information on employment/unemployment was not adequate.

The progress that Richard Santos mentioned for participants, if I've got his figures right, of an increase in salary from \$2.98 an hour to \$3.13 an hour is not much progress. One of the weaknesses of government programs that academicians need to try to help is to provide better answers. As they do their research, the help they provide usually does not raise the recipients above the level of poverty. Now several people again mentioned that. We, who are here, have it made, and someone was commenting that the Blacks in the 70s had it made--okay, but the average Black in the ghetto, the one who did not plan these conferences and did not participate in this conference, really

at the end of the 70s was not that much better off than at the beginning of the 70s.

I get very concerned, and I know that it is controlled by the government, about making sure when we are trying to help people instead of just helping them to remain in poverty. And CETA, I think, needs to address that problem. I think academicians need to do research with CETA about how we can address that problem. This gets to another issue which I will talk about very quickly in a minute.

How effective are the programs that we have? I think that needs to be addressed not only in a broad area, but also in regional studies, in individual studies in different CETA programs, and within those CETA programs which have been most effective. Different people mentioned program Title I was good here, Title II good there, Title III good there, Title VII worked there. What works where and why? I think we need a lot of research, in which academicians can help the program directors to understand better what is going on and why things are working and whether there is any way to help the program do more than simply provide jobs. The program should actually improve the quality of life. Because if we do not do that, then we have not succeeded.

By the way, parenthetically here, how can we make women, who have the worst disadvantage of the minorities, a priority of CETA? Nobody picked up much on that except that one of the speakers mentioned a few minutes ago that it came out in their session. Lupe Anguiano mentioned women. She felt very definitely that CETA was not primarily concerned about women. I noticed that MALDEF had a little pamphlet about women in CETA, but I think that is part of the disadvantage of the disadvantage. Women, not just Chicano women or Hispano women, are not only discriminated against for being female, but are also discriminated against for being Hispanic. And that creates extra problems for them. By the way, again as a pat on the back to the planners of this conference, there were a lot of women here, more than you see at most conferences of this sort. I recently went to a meeting where there were only one or two females out of about 30 participants in the conference.

Two last things I want to talk about one is the problem of all Hispanic groups being grouped into one. Marta Tienda, Walter Fogel, and others touched on this matter. I think the issue is very important, maybe more important than we want to think, but at a deeper level than simply the fact that Hispano sub groups are different. I think the tendency to group all Hispanos together is a reflection of the dominant society's attitude, which was touched on by one of the speakers. He said that as far as the legislature and representatives in Congress are concerned, all minorities are alike. I would only add that too often the bureaucrats of the organizations of the government, I am sorry, including DOL at times, assume that all Hispanos are alike. Then I would worry that academicians and program directors

will forget that the human beings in their own programs are each different. So, keep that in mind. There is commonality, by the way, shared by Hispanos. It goes back to many things that we share, but language is the thing that permits us to cross those barriers.

The last challenge I put before you is the most difficult to address. It deals with, what some of you have called during the session at different times, the structural problems facing Hispanos. Too much of the conference as far as I am concerned has focused on changing Hispanics. Here and there persons have mentioned that there are structural problems. Yet, I believe that we have avoided talking about institutional racism, institutional sexism, and because of something Marta Tienda said, institutional classism. We can talk about the difference between the ascribed and achieved mobility that Marta mentioned yesterday. Things which are built into the structure of a dominant society, prevent the Hispanos, regardless of what we do, from really having a fair shake in the game.

Ambassador Torres said we may pursue the career of our choice; our future is bright, the 80s will be the decade of the Hispanos. But you know that does not apply very clearly to the people in the colonias, barrios, el valle, Rio Grande, nor do I think that it applies to most of the recipients of the services that CETA provides. Barriers are in their way, not only of their own choosing, but also created and put there by a dominant society. These barriers make it very difficult for people to escape the poverty cycle. That is why I said earlier that I was concerned about just helping people to get jobs that increase their salary from \$2.98 to \$3.13 an hour. By the way that was not just a knock at Richard Santos. In the valley we had a big strike one time, and their salaries were \$2.25 an hour, and they settled the strike at \$2.50 an hour one week before the minimum salary went up to \$2.65 an hour. They were so proud that the strike had been effective. Yet we have to watch for those kinds of things.

Again, a major weakness of this conference was that it did not address the need to change the system that oppresses the poor which includes many of the Hispanos. Part of the problem, you may not agree with me, is that we are a part of and benefit from that system. We are the successful Hispanos; we make the good monies, we have the good salaries. Yet, I am convinced and continue to be convinced that the system is oppressive, as I see the small progress or lack of progress in many areas for some of the Hispanic groups. Walter Fogel documented some of that. And the SIE data, combined with earlier census data for the 70s and 60s, clearly show that progress has really been insignificant because the gains which we have made have been matched by the gains made by the members of the dominant society so that our real gains have not been that significant. We need, I think, somehow to focus more with some real hard data on the problems related to these institutional structural problems that prevent the poor from having a fair shake.

Let me close on a positive note, however. The symposium I said at the beginning is a step in the right direction, and maybe its greatest benefit, at least I think it will be for me, is that it increases our awareness of the problems facing the disadvantaged. It permits us to exchange ideas so that we may have new ideas or re-think our own ideas as we go back home. It encourages interaction with colleagues, both academicians and non academicians, that will carry over the future. Then, wherever we may be, as we serve through our universities and through our federal programs for the disadvantaged, hopefully, we really may do a slightly better job.

**NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON
HISPANICS AND CETA • 1980**

The Program

UTSA SYMPOSIUM ON HISPANICS AND CETA

St. Anthony Hotel

WEDNESDAY - JANUARY 30

5:00 - 9:00	REGISTRATION	LOBBY
7:00 - 9:00	RECEPTION	CAVALIER ROOM

THURSDAY - JANUARY 31

8:00 - 9:00	REGISTRATION	LOBBY
9:00 - 9:20	WELCOME	ANACACHO ROOM

Honorable Lila Cockrell
Mayor, City of San Antonio
Dr. James W. Wagener
President, The University of Texas at San Antonio

9:20 - 9:30	INTRODUCTION	
-------------	--------------	--

Mr. Eugene Rodriguez, Jr.
Co-Director, Human Resources Management and Development
Program, The University of Texas at San Antonio
Dr. E. D. Hodo
Dean, College of Business, The University of Texas at San Antonio

9:30 - 9:45	"ABRAZO"	
-------------	----------	--

Dr. Tomas Rivera
Chancellor, University of California at Riverside

9:45 - 10:30	KEYNOTE ADDRESS: HISPANICS AND CETA	
--------------	-------------------------------------	--

Introduction:

Mr. Richard Flores
Regional Administrator, Region VI, Employment and Training
Administration, United States Department of Labor

Speaker:

Mr. Ernest Green
Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration,
United States Department of Labor

Additional Remarks from Dr. Eli Ginzberg
Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy

10:30 - 10:45 BREAK

10:45 - 11:45 CETA POLICY IMPLEMENTATION REALITIES

ANACACHO ROOM

Moderator: *Dr. Henry Cisneros*
Faculty Associate, Human Resources
Management and Development Program, UTSA

Speaker: *Mr. Harry Greenspan*
Research Associate, Committee on Evaluation of
Employment and Training Program,
National Academy of Sciences

Panel: *Mr. Pedro Garza*
National Director, SER-Jobs for Progress
Mr. Roy Escarcega
Member, National Commission for Employment
Policy
Ms. Lupe Anquiano
President, National Women's Employment and
Education, Inc.

11:45 - 12:15 DISCUSSION

12:30 - 2:00 LUNCH

PERAUX ROOM

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA AS A POLICY TOOL

Introduction:

Dr. Gordon H. Lamb
Vice President for Academic Affairs, The University of
Texas at San Antonio

Address:

Dr. Sar A. Levitan
Director, Center for Social Policy Studies, The
George Washington University

2:15 - 3:30 REPORTS ON HISPANIC DATA SOURCES

ANACACHO ROOM

Introduction:

Ms. Lynda de la Vina
Assistant Director, Human Resources Management and
Development Program, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Research and Activities at the Hispanic Research Center

Dr. Rosemary Santana-Cooney
Senior Research Associate, Hispanic Research Center
Fordham University

Hispanic Americans in the 1980 Census:

Dr. Leobardo Estrada
Staff Assistant to the Deputy Director, United States
Bureau of the Census

National Chicano Survey:

Dr. Carlos Arce
Project Director, Survey Research Center, University
of Michigan

National Logitudinal Use Survey:

Dr. Richard Santos
Senior Research Associate, Center for Human Resources
Research, Ohio State University

Data and Reports of Persons of Hispanic Origins:

Mr. Harvey Ramel
Senior Economist, Office of Current Employment and Analysis,
Bureau of Labor Statistics

Puerto Rican Youth Employment Survey:

Dr. Jose Oscar Alers
Coordinator, Puerto Rican Migration Research Consortium, Inc.
New York

3:30 - 3:45

BREAK

3:45 - 4:15

SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE HISPANIC-AMERICAN WORKER

Dr. Marta Tienda
Assistant Professor, Department of Rural Sociology,
University of Wisconsin at Madison

4:15 - 4:40

CETA AND THE HISPANIC WORKER: PARTICIPANT PROFILES

Dr. Richard Santos
Senior Research Associate, Ohio State University
and

Dr. Gilbert Cardenas
Fellow, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

4:40 - 5:00

DISCUSSION

7:30 - 9:00

DINNER

Introduction:

Dr. Fred Romero
Deputy Administrator of Policy, Evaluation and Research
Employment and Training Administration, United States
Department of Labor

Honored Guest and Speaker:

AMBASSADOR ESTEBAN TORRES
Special Assistant to the President for Hispanic Affairs

FRIDAY - FEBRUARY 1

9:00 - 10:30 SOCIOECONOMIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

ANACACHO ROOM

Introduction:

Mr. Eugene Rodriguez, Jr.
Co-Director, Human Resources Management and Development
Program, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Research on Hispanics in the Labor Market:

Dr. Walter Fogel
Professor, Graduate School of Management, University of
California at Los Angeles

Department of Labor Research and Development Programs:

Dr. Howard Rosen
Project Officer, Office of Research and Development,
Employment and Training Administration, United States
Department of Labor

QUESTIONS

10:45 - 1:00 CONCURRENT SMALL GROUP SESSIONS ON PROGRAMS, POLICY,
AND RESEARCH ON HISPANIC AMERICANS

Moderator: *Dr. Fred Romero*
Deputy Administrator of Policy, Evaluation
and Research, Employment and Training
Administration, United States Department of
Labor

Session 1 - Workers and Their Characteristics:

Topics: Women, Youth, Rural Workers, Immigrants

Resource Persons:

Dr. Marta Tienda
Assistant Professor, Department of Rural Sociology,
University of Wisconsin at Madison

Dr. Rosemary Santana-Cooney
Senior Research Associate, Hispanic Center,
Fordham University

Ms. Ellen Sehgal
Chief, Division of Research Methods and Services, Office
of Research and Development, Employment and Training
Administration, United States Department of Labor

10:45 - 1:00 CONCURRENT SMALL GROUP SESSIONS ON PROGRAMS, POLICY
AND RESEARCH ON HISPANIC AMERICANS (continued)

Session 2 - Employers and the job Environment:

Topics: Recruitment Practices, Discrimination,
Organizational Behavior, Career Paths,
Labor-Management Relations, Unions

Resource Persons:

Dr. Jerry I. Porras
Associate Professor, Graduate School of Business
Stanford University
Dr. Miguel Pirado
Professor of Industrial Relations and Public
Administration, California State University, Sonoma

Session 3 - Labor Markets:

Topics: Job Search, Labor Market Information,
Investment on Human Capital, Regional
Economic Development, Labor Mobility

Resource Persons:

Dr. Ron Oaxaca
Associate Professor, Department of Economics,
University of Arizona
Dr. Marcia Freedman
Senior Research Associate, Conservation of Human
Resources, Columbia University

Session 4 - Institutions and Interventions

Topics: Human Resources Management and Development
Programs, Community-Based Organizations and
Advocacy Groups, Educational Systems, Public
Policy

Resource Persons:

Dr. Burt Barnow
Deputy Director, Office of Research and Development,
Employment and Training Administration, United States
Department of Labor
Dr. Louise Wolitz
Faculty Associate, Human Resources Management and
Development Program, The University of Texas at
San Antonio

1:15 - 3:00 LUNCH

ANACACHO ROOM

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN ACADEMIA AND PUBLIC POLICY
PROCESSES

Introduction:

Dr. Antonio Furino
Director, Human Resources Management and Development
Program, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Summary of Small Group Sessions:

Dr. Fred Romero
Deputy Administrator of Policy, Evaluation and Research,
Employment and Training Administration, United States
Department of Labor

Address - Concluding the Symposium:

Dr. David Alvirez
Dean, School of Behavioral Sciences, Pan American University